

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, January 28, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thy name, O Lord Most High, for Thy infinite goodness and for Thy condescension toward all Thy children. We thank Thee for another day, which is a door by which we may enter upon our chosen task, perform the unselfish act, and live the beautiful life. At the very summits of our beings may we know the unknowable, see the unseen, and, though of this earth, yet lose ourselves in God. Ever keep open the pathway of our dearest longings and our purest desires. We would accept and make Thee the outward and unselfish aim of our lives. Bless our children and friends, for they are the dearest treasures of earth. Let unbroken love and everlasting joy crown every head. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2668. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at Boonville, Mo., in substitution for and in lieu of an existing bridge constructed under the authority of an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at Boonville, Mo.," approved May 11, 1872;

S. 3168. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington," by adding thereto two new sections, to be numbered sections 8 and 9; and

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution authorizing the use of tribal moneys belonging to the Fort Berthold Indians of North Dakota for certain purposes.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to-morrow, the 29th day of January, is the anniversary of the birth of William McKinley. I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McClintock] be permitted to address the House not to exceed 15 minutes on the life and character of William McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

## THE PROPOSED POTOMAC PARK

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the proposed Potomac River Park by printing in the RECORD a minority report by former Chief of Engineers, Gen. Edgar Jadwin, on that subject, and a letter addressed to me discussing certain features of the report by the executive committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the proposed Potomac River Park by printing a minority report by former Chief of Engineers, General Jadwin, and a letter addressed to himself discussing the matter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,  
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1930.

HON. RILEY J. WILSON,

President National Rivers and Harbors Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Under a special rule, the Cramton bill (H. R. 26) is to be considered by the House of Representatives on January 30.

The fundamental purpose of this bill—which is to provide in and adjacent to the city of Washington a series of parks and playgrounds befitting the Capital of a great Nation—has our thorough approval. But we desire to enter an emphatic protest against the enactment at this time of that portion of the bill (lines 16 to 19, p. 2) which would make impossible the development of either navigation or power on the Potomac River.

To the question of power, much study has been given. Nine years ago a report, commonly called the Tyler report, which was made after an exhaustive investigation of the possibilities, declared that hydro-electric development at Great Falls, and in the adjacent territory along the Potomac, is feasible, whether developed by the Government or by a commercial concern. Three applications for water-power development on the upper Potomac are now pending before the Federal Power Commission.

Some two years ago the House passed a resolution which prohibits the Federal Power Commission from acting on any application for power development at Great Falls until the commission shall submit a complete and up-to-date report on the relation of such development to the Potomac-Great Falls Parkway proposed in the Cramton bill. That report has not yet been submitted to Congress, although it probably will be in the near future.

The first attempt to connect the Potomac and Ohio Rivers was made by a company of which George Washington was the president. The remains of a lock built by that company are still visible at Great Falls. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, begun in 1828, was finished to Cumberland, Md., in 1851 and was long employed in carrying coal to Washington. Since its practical destruction by a flood a few years ago little has been said regarding navigation in the Potomac Valley.

Congress has authorized surveys of more than 200 rivers, the Potomac being one, in order to determine how far they may be used for navigation, power, irrigation, or flood control. A preliminary survey of the Potomac, made at a cost of \$30,000, showed the strong probability that a combined development could be made which would provide a channel 12 or 14 feet deep up to Cumberland, an important amount of hydro-electric power, and a large degree of flood control.

Thereupon, a comprehensive survey of the Potomac and its tributaries—to include the feasibility of a canal to connect the Potomac and the Ohio—was ordered at an additional cost of \$150,000. That survey has been under way for several months, but will not be completed, and the report thereon submitted to Congress, until July of the present year.

The members of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with the exception of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, its chairman, favor devoting the Gorge and Great Falls of the Potomac, exclusively and permanently, to park purposes, deeming the development of power as comparatively unimportant and giving no consideration whatever to the possibilities of navigation.

The annual report of that commission publishes the report of the majority in full (pages 40-41) but contents itself with the simple statement that General Jadwin did not concur in the views of the commission and recorded a detailed statement in support of his views. The facts and arguments presented by General Jadwin are much too important to be ignored, and a copy of his minority report is, therefore, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Congress undoubtedly has the authority to dedicate the Great Falls of the Potomac to park purposes, to the development of navigation or power, or to such combination thereof as shall be found feasible and desirable when all the facts are known. It seems to us, however, the reverse of wise statesmanship to order two elaborate and costly investigations of the subject and then to legislate thereon before those investigations have been completed and the results made available for study.

We earnestly request, therefore, that you will use your best efforts to defeat the Cramton bill, unless it shall be so amended that decision as to the disposition of the Gorge and Great Falls of the Potomac shall be deferred until that decision can be made in the light of all pertinent facts.

Very truly yours,

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,  
JOS. E. RANDELL, *Chairman*,  
ROY MILLER,  
FRANK P. LEITCH,  
JNO. H. SMALL,  
S. A. THOMPSON, *Secretary*.

## THE PROPOSED POTOMAC RIVER PARK

(Minority report of Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, and Chairman National Capital Park and Planning Commission)

1. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission is organized by act of Congress as a planning commission as well as a park commission. The broad official representation and the varied technical and business representation are intended to assure broad, well-rounded planning and consideration of the interests of the District, its taxpayers, and of the Federal Government. There are enough data available now to consider the development at Great Falls as a whole. We should give due weight to every element which affects the best interests of national planning as well as the specific matters bearing on parks. Those other elements are the development of power, navigation, flood control, and other allied economic interests. The parks should fit into the scheme of the Nation and not the Nation in the scheme for parks. Large areas of ground should not now be bought and funds spent in developing them

as a park if they are to be flooded later to develop power and navigation on the river.

2. The potential value of a rational development of the power possibilities of the river is tangible and too great to be ignored in the determination of the present policy for the development of this reach of the Potomac.

The potential power of the Potomac was held by the Federal Power Commission in its review of the Tyler project to be "a national asset of incalculable value." Hydroelectric power is dependable. Since the water power is not subject to disturbances because of shortage of coal, labor, and transportation, as is steam power in times of stress, there would be assured the continuous functioning of activities essential to the normal operation of the National Capital when those commodities are at a premium.

Abundant power and cheap power will tend to create new markets, new wealth, and new taxes. Interconnections with other large power systems will be mutually advantageous in extending and interchanging the advantages of cheaper power in large quantities not only to the area adjacent to the Potomac but also to the middle Atlantic section. That one of the leading utility companies of the country wishes authority to develop the project is practical evidence that a market is in sight.

If the power plants at Great Falls are built by private companies, the annual taxes thereon, estimated to be over \$850,000, at 6 per cent, represent a capital value of over \$14,000,000.

The District engineer, Maj. Brehon B. Somervell, estimates the cost of power produced by such a hydro plant at approximately a million dollars per annum cheaper than equivalent steam-produced power. These savings capitalized at 6 per cent represent a capital value of \$15,000,000.

Not only will there be a capital saving by the cheaper generation of power but there will result a saving of fuel coal. Annually there should be consumed 500,000 tons. The ultimate depletion of the ground reserves of coal will be deferred by the noncombustion of this large annual decrement. The resulting undepleted reserves of coal have a present appreciable value and a future value probably so large that it is difficult to estimate.

3. The potentialities for navigation on the Potomac are great.

The intracoastal waterway is assured from Massachusetts to Florida. Soon insistent demands may be expected that its benefits be extended up the Potomac to Cumberland.

The canalization of the Ohio River assures 9-foot navigation from the coal fields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia on the Monongahela down the Ohio and Mississippi to New Orleans and a connection with world sea trade. Improvement of Mississippi tributaries is under way. A connection between the Potomac and the Monongahela will naturally follow, thus joining the vast Mississippi system to the intracoastal waterway by a waterway of adequate capacity along the route selected by the first President of the Republic.

The dams built for the development of power will then likewise be useful for navigation and will save some \$14,000,000 which would otherwise have to be spent for construction costs for that purpose.

The district engineer reports that conferences with the chief examiner of the Interstate Commerce Commission indicate a prospective annual saving of \$3,000,000 on a completed 12-foot project between Washington and Cumberland. This is based on present traffic and without allowance for the normal great future increase or that which can logically be expected to follow the construction of the connection with the Mississippi River system. The larger traffic which may be expected in the future will increase these savings. Better navigation and cheaper water rates would result with a series of high dams and deep pools than with low dams and narrow channels. Therefore the \$14,000,000 saving in the construction cost is not a full measure of the dual employment of the dams.

4. Other incidental advantages accrue from the placing of dams across the river. The reservoirs which afford the power development would reduce the cost of operating the purification system of the Washington water supply. The item for chemicals in the Budget for 1930 is \$70,000, and this will increase yearly. The district engineer estimates that due to the aid of the reservoirs created by the river dams, the bill for chemicals would be reduced three-quarters. This average annual amount represents a capital value of about \$1,000,000.

The protection of certain low areas in and around Washington would cost in the neighborhood of \$175,000. The local works for this purpose would not be entirely satisfactory and would interfere to some extent with the street and park system. So it does not appear feasible to protect all the threatened property by local works. If the flood damages were 5 per cent of the assessed valuation for a maximum possible flood, the protection afforded would be \$6,000,000. Studies indicate that the average annual flood damage below Great Falls over a long period of years will be about \$60,000. Capitalizing this amount at 6 per cent, the value of flood protection may be taken as at least \$1,000,000.

The toll bridges which are contemplated if the power project is not constructed would in the power project be provided on the top of the dams and thereby save about \$3,000,000.

5. A summation of the various potential values which would inure to the financial benefit of the people by rational development of Potomac River resources would be approximately \$48,000,000:

(a) Savings on production of hydro-power instead of steam power, capitalized on a 6 per cent basis at...	\$15,000,000
(b) Saving by elimination of two bridges.....	3,000,000
(c) Savings in the form of income from taxes at the rate of 2 per cent, capitalized at.....	14,000,000
(d) Savings which the power structures would produce if navigation should be extended up the Potomac River, amounting to.....	14,000,000
(e) Savings on preliminary treatment of the Washington water supply, and estimated value of flood protection.....	2,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>48,000,000</b>

With the present population, about \$10,000,000 of the total savings would fall to the specific benefit of the residents and the government of the District of Columbia, and \$38,000,000 to the adjacent States and to the country at large.

The value due to the conservation of the coal, should, when more definitely determined, be added to the above \$48,000,000. The same is true of the increased net freight savings which will come from the navigation improvement and the growth of commerce.

6. Should the development be by the Government, the benefits from taxes on the private enterprise should, if the plant be properly managed and regulated, be replaced by a similar reduction in the total cost of generating the current.

7. This \$48,000,000 is equivalent, at 6 per cent, to about \$2,880,000 per year. This is too large an amount to be sacrificed without the most careful consideration. Let us see whether it is justified as an expenditure for parks in the District in addition to the amounts already spent and those otherwise in contemplation for park purposes.

8. It is important that Washington, the Capital of the Nation, should have an excellent system of parks. The existing park area and that planned by the commission for the National Capital region—that is, Washington and its environs—total some 21,532 acres. To this figure should be added about 7,500 acres for the smaller and local parks in the region outside the District of Columbia. This makes a total of 29,032 acres, or about 45 square miles, roughly equal to three-fourths of the total land area of the District of Columbia and about 10 per cent of the 288,000 acres affected in the District and its environs. In addition, the city has a relatively large mileage of wide streets lined with beautiful shade trees. This park system of the District is being carefully studied by the Planning Commission and is being continuously added to as found justified. It is a park system of which any city or any nation might be proud. The Valley of the Potomac should be included in the system. How shall its park resources be utilized?

Shall a park of the low-level type be developed at the sacrifice of over \$48,000,000, plus the cost of low-lying land and its development? Or can a plan be devised that will save this sum to the taxpayer without sacrificing park values? To assist in determining this a special joint committee was appointed by the executive officer of the Planning Commission and the District engineer of the War Department. The plan, known as scheme C, proposed in the report of this special joint committee, contemplates a high-level park development of an area equal to that in the low-level park, with two lakes substituted for the lowest, most ragged part of the flood plain. These parks contain more recreational features than the parks without these lakes. The major scenic feature of the gorge, the Black Pond area, and Difficult Run are common to both developments. The remainder of the low-level park is a park around four small lakes separated by rapids, while the remainder of the high level is based on two large lakes separated by rapids.

With the latter plan, the spectacle at Great Falls and in the gorge below them will be maintained in comparable but modified form. The regulation to be secured from the upper storage reservoirs would assure an amount of water to pass over the rocks of the falls sufficient to produce scenic effects comparable with those which would exist with flows in the river in its present condition. At the time of flood flow, less flow will pass over the falls. In dry periods more water would pass over the falls, due to the regularization of the flow from storage.

The low-level park is costly to improve as a park, costly to maintain on account of the floods that would ravage it from time to time, and would probably afford less real recreation and enjoyment to the public than would the delightful boating waters and wooded shores incident to the high-level park.

9. Consideration must be given to the general interests of the District and the country as well as to parks for the District. It is not sound to ignore the financial situation of the Federal Government and that of the District of Columbia where expenditures are double and where funds raised through local taxation have trebled during the last 10 years, nor to disregard the rights and interests of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and other States in the power resources of the Potomac River and the navigation possibilities of the Potomac as a feeder to the intracoastal waterway and as a connection from that system to the Mississippi Valley system.

10. To summarize, comprehensive planning for the National Capital demands that all major elements of the situation be considered. The decision lies between a park prodigal of the latent resources of the Potomac and an equally good park conserving these resources. Combined park and power development is feasible, and the waste of more than \$48,000,000 of potential values for debatable minor scenic consideration is neither necessary, desirable, nor sound.

EDGAR JADWIN,

Major General, Chief of Engineers, Chairman.

WASHINGTON D. C., August 2, 1929.

#### DEATH OF COL. I. M. ULLMAN

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard, with very deep sorrow, of the death in my home city of New Haven of one of the strong, able, and influential men of my State, Col. I. M. Ullman, a man who through many years has given very largely of himself and of his means for the betterment and upbuilding of his home city and its people. I have just issued a very brief statement to the papers in appreciation of Colonel Ullman, and now ask unanimous consent that I may extend this brief statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

The sudden death of Col. I. M. Ullman, when his condition seemed to be gradually improving, is a great shock. For more than 30 years Colonel Ullman has influenced to a greater extent than any other man the political and civic affairs of New Haven, and his death is an irreparable loss to the city.

By sheer force of character and unselfish devotion to the city of his birth he achieved great power, and he used it in the interest of the city and the people who lived in it. He devoted much of time and vital energy to politics, but always used the power thus gained for the public good. After more than a quarter of a century of political leadership no one dare say that Colonel Ullman ever made a personal profit, either directly or indirectly, out of his political activity. After an intimate friendship, both political and personal, of 30 years I can say that I never found any motive for his political interest except an honest and sincere desire to serve his community, his State, and his country.

Colonel Ullman was not interested in politics alone. He was interested in every cause for civic betterment and every worthy charity. Everyone knew him as a political leader, but few, except those very close to him, knew the extent of his personal contributions in money and time to charitable causes. In his devotion to this work he drew no line between Jew and Gentile or Catholic and Protestant. He started and for a time bore the principal burden in carrying on the community chest. He headed the New Haven Hospital, and more than any other one man made that institution the great hospital it is to-day. He was the first to make the New Haven Chamber of Commerce a real force for civic betterment rather than a mere selfish organization of business men for mutual advantage.

By the death of Colonel Ullman I lose a friend who stood by me through thick and thin since I entered public life. He was loyal to me, and I should have been worse than an ingrate had I not been equally loyal to him. He was true to me while he lived, and I shall be loyal to his memory now that he has gone. At some stages in my political career I might have improved my political fortunes by surrendering this friendship, but there was never a thought of wavering. I am more than glad that our mutual friendship and loyalty endured to the very end.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8960) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8960, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the Commissioner from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA].

Mr. DAVILA. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of my remarks I ask that the Clerk read in my time a communication received by Gen. F. LeJ. Parker, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, from Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Governor of Porto Rico.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, PORTO RICO,  
San Juan, P. R., January 17, 1930.

Brig. Gen. F. LeJ. PARKER,

Chief, Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL PARKER: I cabled you to-day on the sugar tariff. My cable was in no way an exaggeration of existing conditions. If the tariff on raw sugar is not raised, Porto Rico is going to be in desperate case. Roughly speaking, our situation is as follows:

There are four large foreign-owned sugar corporations, which produce each year 385,000 tons of sugar. That represents about 50 per cent of our production. The balance consists of the combined production of a number of smaller mills, the largest of which turns out 31,000 tons. We have made a careful survey of these smaller mills with reference to their financial situation. We have consulted with well-known bankers on the matter. Doctor Chardon and Mr. Domenech have studied personally their individual and general conditions. Our opinion now is that of these smaller mills, 31 will go into the hands of receivers in July next if the tariff on raw sugar is not raised. These 31 mills are divided as follows: Four are financed with foreign capital, 27 are Porto Rican concerns owned by Porto Ricans.

To phrase it differently, it is our belief now, based on careful investigation, that every Porto Rican-owned mill will be put into the hands of a receiver by next July unless the House stands firm and the tariff on raw sugar is raised.

The condition outlined above has been brought about by a series of misfortunes, among which the cyclone holds a prominent place. None of the mills made money last year. All lost money. As a result, all have had to draw on their capital in order to operate. The small mills have small capital, and it is exhausted. Every last one of them is heavily mortgaged.

In reciting the above condition it is hardly necessary to amplify on what the effect would be of such a catastrophe. You know what the situation of our banks is. If these 31 mills failed, I think it is almost certain that bank failures would follow in their train. Should our credit system, which is in such a precarious position, receive a blow of this sort, it is difficult to know how far the consequences would go. About 25,000 of our laborers who are now getting the scanty pay that meagerly supports them from these mills would be out of work. There is nowhere else they could turn for aid.

We have four principal agricultural crops on the island—sugar, tobacco, fruit, and coffee. The cyclone ruined our coffee. This year our crop will be negligible. Heavy rains have damaged our tobacco crop by 30 per cent, in the opinion of our department of agriculture.

Therefore the failure to pass an increased tariff on raw sugar would at this time spell disaster for our rehabilitation plans for the island of Porto Rico.

Would you mind giving a copy of this letter to Don FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA?

Yours very sincerely,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Mr. DAVILA. Mr. Chairman, the situation pictured in the governor's letter is by no means exaggerated. We are facing the most difficult crisis of our history. We are very much in need of assistance to carry out effectively the rehabilitation of the island. I have frequently heard the argument that an increase in the tariff on sugar will produce an economic destruction in Cuba which would be resented in other Latin-American countries. Great importance has been given to this argument by the opponents of an increase in the duty on sugar.

It has been said at the other end of the Capitol that to disrupt the economic welfare of Cuba would inevitably create a feeling throughout the other Latin-American countries against the United States, because they would contend that this country has not treated Cuba fairly in this respect.

We contend that the failure of Congress to increase the tariff on sugar will mean disaster for the Porto Rican producer and will disrupt the economic welfare of the island. I do not believe that a reasonable raise in the duty on sugar will produce an economic upheaval in Cuba, but even assuming for the sake of the argument that this may be true, I want to call your attention to the fact that Porto Rico is also a Latin-American community and in addition, an integral part of the American family.

If by raising the tariff on sugar an economic crisis is created in Cuba and animosity against the United States is felt throughout Latin America, what would be the effect produced in these same countries when they hear of the economic calamity which will inevitably face us by the refusal of Congress to grant a reasonable increase on this product?

Being of Latin-American origin, both countries enjoy the friendship and have the good will of the Republics to the south of us, but I feel that the 1,500,000 American citizens of Porto Rico should be entitled to more attention and consideration by

the United States than the citizens of any foreign country. This is well known by the Latin-American Republics. They are aware of the fact that the United States has the solemn duty to look after the welfare of Porto Rico, it being a part of the Nation, and a policy of discrimination in favor of Cuba and against Porto Rico, certainly will not receive the approval of these countries.

I venture to say that if in its dealings with both countries the United States should show partiality in favor of Cuba to the detriment of Porto Rico, such a policy, far from creating a feeling of good will toward this country, would produce the opposite effect. They would never be able to understand how the United States can be more generous and considerate to a member of the Latin-American family foreign to this country than to another member of the same family now forming a part of the United States and dependent on it for its political life and future prosperity.

I have the most friendly feeling toward the Cuban people, I wish them prosperity and happiness, but I can not go the limit of favoring one of their industries at the expense of the interests of the Porto Rican people. It is my opinion, however, that a reasonable increase in the duty on sugar will not work a hardship on the Cuban sugar industry. Cuba is protected by a 20 per cent tariff preferential. She will always supply the deficiency on the part of the United States production by reason of this preferential. The reciprocity treaty has given to Cuban sugar such an advantage over sugar from other exporting countries as practically to eliminate the importation into the United States of sugar from countries other than Cuba.

It has been argued by the opponents of an increase in the tariff on this product that this increase will be a burden on American consumers. If that is true, I can not see how the Cuban industry can be injured when she does not pay the increase.

I hope that Governor Roosevelt's letter will convince Congress of the gravity of our situation and that some action be taken to avoid the catastrophe which he mentions. The ruin of Porto Rico's agriculture means the ruin of Porto Rico. The ruin of the sugar industry of Porto Rico means the ruin of Porto Rico. The ruin of the sugar industry in Porto Rico means increased prosperity for Cuba, and with that will come increased prices without the brake that is now afforded by Porto Rican sugar production. Even if you arrive at the conclusion, which appears to be untenable, that an adequate increase in the duty on sugar will create an economic crisis in Cuba, you will have to choose between Cuba and Porto Rico, and in my opinion there should be no hesitancy on the part of Congress as to which of the two countries should be chosen. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVILA. With pleasure.

Mr. COLE. How much of a tariff is deemed necessary to protect the sugar industry of Porto Rico—how much of an increase?

Mr. DAVILA. As you know, the \$2.20 on Cuban sugar, as recommended by the Senate Committee on Finance, was defeated. That is the reason of asking for an adequate increase.

Mr. COLE. How about a \$2 tariff?

Mr. DAVILA. A \$2 tariff will not be enough, but if passed by Congress it will be welcomed by us.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVILA. Yes.

Mr. HOOPER. The raising of coffee is now the second industry in the island, but has been first in the past, has it not?

Mr. DAVILA. In the past it was first; but, now, I believe the industries are in this order: Sugar, tobacco, coffee, and fruits.

Mr. HOOPER. The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: How long, in the gentleman's judgment, will it be before the destruction caused by the hurricane to the coffee plantations in the island will be so remedied that they will be able again to produce the crops of coffee they have been producing in the past?

Mr. DAVILA. It will take from four to five years.

Mr. HOOPER. And that, combined with the sugar situation, has brought about a very depressed economic condition in the island?

Mr. DAVILA. A very depressed economic condition in Porto Rico; and I will say to the gentleman that we are now facing the most difficult crisis in the history of our island.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was rather startled this morning to read a copy of a letter that was issued by the Attorney General, wherein he lays down some rather startling standards by which officials

subsequently to be appointed in his department shall be judged. He says he is not going to appoint a United States attorney or an assistant United States attorney or marshals, bailiffs, or clerks unless and until their personal habits are examined and gone into thoroughly, and that he is going to set in motion a sort of inquisition to determine whether or not a marshal, a bailiff, or clerk or United States attorney at any time takes a drink; that he is going to examine into the innermost recesses of the minds of those appointees to determine whether or not their attitude is strictly prohibition. Well, I wonder how far the Attorney General is going to get with that kind of a proposition? I should like to ask him whether he is going to direct that inquiry not only to the United States attorneys who are now in office but whether he is going to direct that inquiry to the officials of the Treasury Department, from the Secretary of the Treasury down? Whether he is going to direct that inquiry to all the sitting judges in the Federal districts, because all those gentlemen have something to do with the enforcement of prohibition. I would even challenge him to direct that inquiry to the United States Supreme Court judges. I do not know anything about their personal habits, but I venture the assertion that when men get as old as some of the distinguished jurists of that the greatest court that ever was, they are entitled to take a nip once in a while.

Some of the members of the Wickersham commission might very well have that inquiry addressed to them. I believe that the former Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, a member of that commission, was opposed to the constitutional amendment and the Volstead Act. In any event his chief, the late lamented President Wilson, vetoed the Volstead Act. Even Wilson would be disqualified by the Mitchell standard.

Just because Mr. Baker may have been opposed to the prohibitory statute, shall that debar him from deliberation on this commission? What about Dean Pound? Let him examine Mr. Pound, that very well-known, wise, far-seeing, astute liberal. I am sure he will find his attitude, being a liberal, is somewhat antiprohibition. Is he going to be debarred from deliberation on this commission because of his opinions?

Take George W. Wickersham, Judge Grubb, Judge McCormick, and other members of the august commission now considering the "noble" prohibition act. I know nothing of their personal habits. I care nothing about them, no more than I care about their religious views. Yet I venture the assertion that it might be embarrassing to stretch these gentlemen across Mitchell's Procrustean dry bed. What a torture it would be if all the Members of Congress and Senate were made to pass the test. Even Governor Smith, according to the standard laid down by this man Mitchell, could not be a bailiff in the United States district court in my own district. And what about Governor Ritchie, as fine a governor as ever graced the gubernatorial chair of any State? He would be hors de combat. And how about the late lamented President Harding? He would be absolutely taboo, according to the dictates and the fiat that comes to us this morning from the United States Attorney General.

And, startling to relate, the disposition of permits under the Volstead Act, under the bill that has been introduced, is to be under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury. Therefore he plays a somewhat important part in the enforcement of prohibition. He would be debarred.

I could give you a list of very eminent gentlemen who likewise would be under the ban of the United States Attorney General because of this opinion he has rendered this morning.

Furthermore, this opinion is only a beau geste. It means nothing from a practical standpoint. Enforcement will become no better. The fellows who want the jobs and who drink, will lie and deceive Mitchell. They will tell him they are "dry," although they may be "wet." That is quite simple. Only by a pernicious system of spying could he discover the truth. Good men who drink would not apply. The result will be that hypocrites will fill the jobs of marshals, bailiffs, clerks, attendants. Only pious Pecksniffs, hereafter, will become United States attorneys and assistants.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, parts of two days or more have been consumed in a general discussion of this bill and other unrelated matters of public importance. I do not think the time has been mispent. Many of the speeches that have been delivered, not relevant to the bill, deserve the careful study and consideration of the House. They relate to the Veterans' Bureau, to the Alaskan fisheries, to the Philippines, to alleged encroachments by Federal courts on State public service commissions pertaining to intrastate matters, to the merchant marine legislation, and other matters of equal importance.

The speeches delivered on the pending bill by members of the subcommittee of which I am a member, I am sure, have also been heard with like interest and profit by the membership.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] gave a very comprehensive picture of the activities of the four departments appropriated for in the pending bill and set forth the accomplishments and needs of each; the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] called attention, in a forceful way, to the State Department and some of its important activities abroad. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] emphasized the importance to American business men of the work now being done by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

It is interesting to note in connection with these appropriations that they total \$113,799,286.14. The receipts from these four departments of the Government paid into the Federal Treasury during the past fiscal year amount to \$36,912,762.36, making the net expense to the Government for carrying on the widely varying, extensive, and important work of these four departments \$76,000,000 plus.

Hopes are entertained that the result of the conference at London may result in an annual saving equal to, if not greater than, the total amount required for the work of these four departments.

Only one of these departments for the past several years has failed to submit what the committee felt was a fairly thorough and comprehensive report of its activities and needs. The committee, I regret to say, has several times felt dissatisfied with the report from the Department of Labor, and the information furnished as to some of its field activities and problems were not sufficiently definite to always give an accurate picture of its needs and accomplishments. Its personnel are most loyal and measure up to as high standards of efficiency as are found in any department.

I have made this statement in the hope that the distinguished head of this department will submit to the committee in person, when we meet in the fall, a comprehensive study and report of what that department has accomplished and what its needs are. I have not been unsympathetic to the Secretary's recommendation for legislation working to a registration of aliens, and a more careful selection of those to be hereafter admitted, so that they will better fit into our economic life; and this in part prompts my suggestion for a personal report of the department's activities under existing law.

In reference to the Department of Justice, to which I shall devote my remaining remarks, this department's importance can not be overemphasized, because however important the legislative branch of the Government is, and it is supremely important, however important the administrative branch of the Government is, and it is likewise supremely important, yet the efforts of both must in a measure fail unless the Department of Justice discharges its responsibilities and duties in a thoroughly efficient way.

Its work must be performed so as to command the respect and confidence of our people, because our courts in an impartial and impersonal interpretation and enforcement of all laws constitutes the real bulwark for the safety and protection of all. The Department of Justice, with an Attorney General as its head, with the powers and duties defined, was really organized in 1870 and started with a small appropriation and a small personnel. Its personnel in 1870 numbered 2,500, which included all judges, district attorneys, clerks, marshals, clerical and other employees, and the appropriation was \$1,813,100. In 1900 its personnel had increased to 3,500 and its appropriation to \$7,990,000. In 1930 its personnel numbered 5,906 and the appropriations for 1930 were \$28,866,000 plus. The department is fortunate in having at its head at this time a lawyer of outstanding ability without political aspirations.

It is important that a great department like this should be presided over by a lawyer of recognized ability, high character, courage, and industry, and I regret to find a Member of the House to-day criticizing a letter recently written by the Attorney General, in which he undertakes to define what he thinks should be qualifications to be considered in determining appointments in the judicial department. I do not believe there are any Members of this House, other than the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who has just spoken, who will take issue with the Attorney General as to the propriety of fixing such qualifications for appointment to positions in the department as are set out in the letter of the Attorney General, to which reference has been made. I will later ask permission to set out the letter as a part of my remarks.

As I read the letter it simply undertakes to fix as the qualifications for appointment in this department ability, integrity, and right aptitude of mind in reference to existing laws. Certainly

our courts and every other agency of the Department of Justice, if they are to command and receive the respect and confidence of our people, must be administered by persons qualified from ability, character, and by a right attitude toward law observance and law enforcement.

It is not for those who serve that department to inquire what the law ought to be; they should be interested only in finding what the law is and what it is right to do under the law. Those holding commissions in that department should feel and understand that their conduct in and out of office must be such as to command the confidence and the respect of the American people for law enforcement and law observance.

I feel that the Attorney General has rendered a distinct service to our people and to the cause of law and order by writing that letter.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Let me finish this.

Until we Members of Congress let the people of the Nation understand that we uphold and approve the announced purpose and determination of the Attorney General of the United States to recommend for appointment only those qualified by ability, character, and a right mental attitude in reference to existing laws we will not have discharged our duty to the fullest measure in upholding the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto. Now, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would suggest that what the gentleman says is applicable to every branch of the Government.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No question about that, but here is a distinguished lawyer who recognizes that he has duties to perform only in reference to one department, and like a good lawyer he does not undertake to discuss matters irrelevant and immaterial, and over which he has no jurisdiction. I am in hearty accord with you that in so far as the qualifications he outlines may affect the performance of duty in any Government position, that that test should be applied, and I am glad to learn by implication, at least, from the gentleman's question that he favors its being extended to all Government positions.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And to the legislative branch also?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Certainly. We make no exception when we come to lay down a rule of conduct which those who are sworn to administer the law should measure up to. But the Attorney General was speaking, of course, in reference to matters over which he had authority, and, as I said before, like a good lawyer he confined his statement to only what he had the right and duty to speak of.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman's opinion on this matter, and I even hesitate in the slightest degree to ruffle him with any sort of a question; but in so far as my opinion has been put at issue, I ask the gentleman whether he would apply that test also to the sitting judges? I am sure there are many sitting judges who occasionally imbibe some liquor. Would the gentleman say that habit of imbibing is good behavior? Would it disqualify them?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am very glad to say that I have already answered the question in the colloquy that I had with the gentleman's colleague from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], and I was delighted to learn that he gave full approval to the opinions that I expressed, though his views may differ from mine about many matters. In so far as undertaking to apply a general rule and prolonging the discussion to make it apply to individual cases, it could serve no useful purpose. If the gentleman will read my answer in reply to the query of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] he will find that I have answered him most completely.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I quite agree with the gentleman's view. I remember we had a law in the State of New York, and I was one of those who was called upon to enforce it as a district attorney. It was a very difficult thing seeing a juror trying to smile up at you and feel that you would kind of smile back at him in those cases. The element of sincerity was lacking. We did not believe in the law, and the result was it could not be enforced.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am glad to number the gentleman from New York with those giving approval to the Attorney General's letter; and as pertinent to the jury reference, permit me to say I was pleased to read recently that a New York judge interrogated the jury panel as to their attitude in reference to certain existing laws. Where they were found to be such as would provoke a smile under the conditions the gentleman has indicated, the judge held that they were not competent to serve

as jurors. I think we at least are making progress along the lines that all seem now to give approval to, whether the test is applied to those in public office or serving on juries.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Yes, I believe the whole test of it is the sincerity of Government officials. If they are hypocrites about it, I do not think they can get anywhere. I think that this will bring it to a very sincere test, when we find that the Government intends to be sincere. My own opinion is that the Government will fail, but that has nothing to do with my approval of the effort at sincerity.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It has the approval seemingly of every Member of the House, and, in saying this, I refer to this effort of the Attorney General to carefully elicit all facts in connection with those who seek appointment in the Judicial Department, and only where he finds that they measure up to the high standards which we as Members of Congress give approval to as laid down by him in his letter will he recommend them for appointment. [Applause.] Let us hope that the head of the Government was not misquoted by the Attorney General when he read into a speech which he made to the American Bar Association this statement:

The President, in speaking of his responsibility as to appointments, said, "It is that he shall to his utmost capacity appoint men to public office who will execute the laws of the United States with integrity and without fear, favor, or political collusion."

The appointive responsibility rests with the President and with the heads of Government departments and I hope that all will observe the same high standards that the Attorney General has indicated will govern him in all appointments high or low, connected with the Department of Justice. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, you shall have gone far to solve many of the serious problems that to-day confront us, if you can let the American people understand and know that those charged with the duty of making the laws, those charged with the duty of administering the laws, and those charged with the duty of interpreting and enforcing the laws, from high to low, must measure up to the standards outlined in the letter which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] saw fit to criticize at one time, and afterwards, as I understand, I am glad to say, modified perhaps his views.

Mr. Celler. Will the gentleman yield? I have not modified my views one iota.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. So then, as far as I now understand, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] stands as the sole Member of the House who gives voice to any criticism of the Attorney General's letter. I am glad to say that his associates who differ just as widely as he does from me, recognize as lawyers—I do not know whether the gentleman who spoke is a lawyer or not, but the other two are—that the ethics of our profession require approval of a standard for official appointments such as the Attorney General has outlined, and which I was glad to see met with hearty response and approval from the American Bar Association, when he quoted an excerpt to the same effect from a statement by the Chief Executive.

Nothing is truer than that every lawyer is a sworn minister of justice. I think it was Webster who said:

Justice is the great interest of man on earth, it is the ligament which holds civilized beings and civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands, and as long as it is honored, there is a foundation for social security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our race.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In view of the gentleman's absolute approval of the Attorney General's recommendation, does not the gentleman think the House made a great mistake the other day when it turned down the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Palmisano], which provided that no one who had been convicted of a felony should be employed by the Prohibition Unit? That was turned down by a vote of 82 to 28.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit me, in a perfectly respectful way, to answer, I will say that if he will talk over the table with Members of this body as to amendments of this character, he will recognize that amendments are sometimes offered, not in the hope that they will pass, and speeches are sometimes made, not in the hope that they will be taken seriously; and that therefore amendments and speeches sometimes really do not express to a large majority of the House sincerity and good faith, and that may explain the action

which the gentleman has suggested was taken by the House. [Applause.]

So long as we can feel and understand that the House gives approval to the letter written by the head of an important Government department outlining just exactly what the amendment the gentleman has referred to would have required, I think we are not failing in our duty to the public in not giving too serious attention to a matter such as the gentleman relates. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman seems to assume for his own purpose that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland was not sincere and not intended to pass. In that the gentleman is absolutely incorrect. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Palmisano] had in mind an officer in his district who was convicted of a felony and afterward employed by the enforcement bureau.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will talk frankly with the gentleman on or off the floor, if anyone questions the sincerity of my statement, and if the gentleman asks me to make it plainer I will make it plainer to him. I have the utmost respect for the opinions of those who differ from me on any question, and never yet have I called in question an honest conviction entertained by a colleague; but I feel that the gentleman—with his long legislative experience—with his knowledge of what transpires in cloakrooms and in private conversations among Members of this House oftentimes in reference to matters occurring on the floor, must agree that I did not incorrectly interpret why the House often takes action such as he has referred to.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to take more of your time. I did want at least to take this opportunity, when the head of a great department for which we are now appropriating many millions is subjected to a bitter criticism, to say that it should at least be understood by the American people that we are providing for this great department the funds it will require in the firm belief that under the direction of the present Attorney General its responsibilities will be discharged with signal fidelity and ability. I question whether Congress can point to any more constructive suggestions than the present Attorney General has submitted to it for consideration—and they are only suggestions. The Attorney General does not give legal opinions to Congress; he can only give legal opinions to the heads of executive departments, but he has submitted some recommendations to the committees of the House and in a perfectly frank way has discussed his reasons therefor.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman from Alabama has not, however, answered my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield myself five additional minutes.

The House Judiciary Committee reported favorably several bills embodying constructive recommendations of the Attorney General for his department, and the House by a large vote passed the bills a few days since. These bills were important and far-reaching. They related largely to prison reforms. There is no man or woman in America who will not be interested in reading the hearings before the Judiciary Committee. Other important recommendations of the Attorney General are now before certain committees of the House and the House will probably later be given an opportunity to consider these. What action will be taken is as yet undetermined. But I submit that all of his recommendations are constructive and show careful thought and study. I am frank to say that they commend themselves very favorably to me. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks the letter of the Attorney General to which I have made frequent reference in my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

January 27, 1930.

MY DEAR ———: I have your letter of January 15 calling attention to the fact that a special agent of this department has been making inquiries from you about candidates for the post of United States marshal in ———, and that in so doing he made inquiries as to whether a candidate was in the habit of using liquor and as to his views about the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act. I am grateful to you for giving my representative an interview and such information as you had concerning the applicant. I have to depend very largely upon the members of the bar around the country for accurate information as to the qualifications of men for all classes of posts under this department, and it is very helpful when I have the opinion of members of the bar whom I know and in whom I have confidence.

The inquiries made by our agents about the habits of candidates as to the use of liquor and their views on prohibition are made at my direction. My purpose is to obtain all the information that is available about any candidate which bears on his qualifications for the post and his probable efficiency, and helps me to form an opinion as to whether he will be an efficient and satisfactory public officer. All facts which bear on these matters are pertinent. United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and United States marshals have directly to do with the enforcement of the national prohibition act and the prosecution of cases under it. So far as the personal use of liquor is concerned, I do not believe that any of the men in these posts should drink under any circumstances.

Stocks of pre-war liquor are a negligible quantity, so far as general consumption is concerned. It is quite generally understood now that this is so, and that with few exceptions liquor that is served is illegally manufactured or imported. If a United States marshal or other official who has to do with the national prohibition act is observed to have a supply of liquor and use it, it is generally assumed that it is obtained from illicit sources, and I do not think that either wets or dries have much respect for a man who participates as a public official in the prosecution of bootleggers and patronizes them for a personal supply of liquor.

With respect to the views of a candidate on prohibition, that is also an important matter bearing on the probable efficiency of the candidate in the prosecution of prohibition cases. No head of any administrative organization would think it wise to assign to a particular task a man who does not believe in what is being done, has no heart in it, and whose activities are constantly hampered by a strong distaste for and disapproval of the work he has to do. While a United States marshal may have less to do with the actual prosecution of prohibition cases than do the United States attorneys and their assistants, he does have a direct relation to the work. He has custody of seized liquors. He is an official of the court and is constantly in touch with jurymen, witnesses, and others interested in these cases. If you have had considerable trial experience, you no doubt have realized what an important influence court attachés such as marshals, bailiffs, and clerks have on the atmosphere of a courthouse during a term of court. If the public officials who are charged with duties in relation to the enforcement of the national prohibition act are known by bootleggers, witnesses, and jurymen to use liquor themselves, with the probability that they are patronizing the illicit traffic in liquors, or their disagreement with prohibition is such that it becomes known or the subject of expression by them or others, it has a demoralizing effect on the whole machinery of law enforcement.

Out of some eighty thousand criminal cases begun in the Federal courts during the last fiscal year, more than half were cases under the national prohibition act. We do not want fanatics or zealots engaged in prosecuting these cases, but as a mere administrative matter it is quite obvious to me that efficient, thorough, and diligent work can not be expected of those who patronize illicit traffic in liquors and have definite and decided opposition to the whole principle of prohibition and make it known. I feel, therefore, that it is my duty in passing upon the qualifications of candidates for these posts to know what their habits are and what their attitude is toward prohibition, and that I could not safely reach a conclusion about their qualifications without knowing these facts.

I have not made any hard and fast rule on the subject, and there are many matters respecting a man's ability and personal qualifications that have to be considered, but I believe that no man who makes a practice of drinking intoxicating liquor or who has definite or pronounced views in opposition to prohibition belongs, during this administration, in any post having directly to do with the prosecution of cases under the national prohibition act. It seems to me that such men had better seek positions in some other branch of the Government or a private occupation. I have not made any blare of trumpets about this matter, but I am not at all reluctant to have it known among those in the service of this department that the habitual use of liquor and opposition to prohibition are very definite handicaps to appointment or reappointment in this service.

I can not see any analogy between applying a religious test as a qualification for public office and the matter of making inquiries as to the personal habits and attitude toward prohibition on the part of candidates for posts having directly to do with the enforcement of the national prohibition act. In the one case a man's religious views have no bearing one way or another on any public activity that he may be required to engage in as a public officer, but in dealing with candidates for United States attorneys and marshals their personal habits in the matter of the use of liquor and their attitude toward prohibition have a direct and undeniable bearing on their efficiency in the performance of their duties.

I am very glad to have you write me on this subject, as I do not want my attitude misunderstood, and I hope after this statement you will agree with me that an administrative officer charged with the duty of selecting men to prosecute cases under the national prohibition act should have accurate information about their personal habits and their

opinions on this subject, to be considered along with information respecting their other qualifications.

With best wishes, very truly yours,

WILLIAM D. MITCHELL,  
Attorney General.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FOREIGN INTERCOURSE—AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS

Ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Spain, and Turkey, at \$17,500 each, \$227,500.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHREVE: On page 6, line 5, after the word "Peru," insert the word "Poland."

Line 6, strike out the figures "\$227,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$245,000."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, just a word. The members of the committee will recall that on January 22, 1930, we passed an act providing for an ambassador at Poland, and this amendment is necessary to conform to that act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to China and the Netherlands, at \$12,000 each, \$24,000.

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Albania, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Dominion of Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Irish Free State, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Salvador, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, and Venezuela, at \$10,000 each; to the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, \$10,000; and to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, \$10,000; in all, \$350,000.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHREVE: Page 6, line 17, strike out the word "Poland" after the word "Persia."

Line 21, strike out the figures "\$350,000," and insert the figures "\$340,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, ambassadors and ministers, \$631,500.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHREVE: On page 7, line 4, strike out the figures "\$631,500," and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$639,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS

To enable the President to provide at the public expense all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, including annual ground rent of the embassy at Tokyo, Japan, for the year ending March 15, 1931, repairs including minor alterations, repairs, supervision, preservation, and maintenance of Government-owned diplomatic properties in foreign countries, and properties acquired under the act approved May 7, 1926, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 22, secs. 291, 296), and including also custodial service, heat, light, water, materials, supplies, tools, seeds, plants, shrubs, and similar objects; postage, telegrams, advertising, ice, and drinking water for office purposes; hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and purchase, maintenance, operation, and hire of other passenger-carrying vehicles, uniforms, furniture, household furniture and furnishings not to exceed \$25,000, typewriters and exchange of same, messenger service, operation, maintenance, and rental of launch for embassy at Constantinople not exceeding \$3,500, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, porters, interpreters, translators, and supervisors of construction, compensation of agents and employees of and rent and other expenses for dispatch

agencies at London, New York, San Francisco, Seattle, and New Orleans, traveling expenses of Diplomatic and Foreign Service officers, including attendance at trade and other conferences or congresses under orders of the Secretary of State as authorized by section 14 of the act approved May 24, 1924 (U. S. C., title 22, sec. 16; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 22, sec. 16), miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, including such loss on bills of exchange to officers of the United States Court for China, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic), rent, including quarters for Foreign Service officers assigned for the study of the languages of Asia and eastern Europe and cost, not exceeding \$350 per annum each, of the tuition of such officers, telephone and other similar services under this appropriation are hereby authorized, \$1,336,325: *Provided*, That no part of this sum appropriated for contingent expenses, foreign missions, shall be expended for salaries or wages of persons (except interpreters, translators, and messengers) not American citizens performing clerical services, whether officially designated as clerks or not, in any foreign mission.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There have been many cases recently where leases have expired—leases made by ministers or envoys—and then a few days after they have executed new leases orders have been given them to go to another post. They then are under obligation to pay for the length of the lease, although they may be compelled to leave shortly afterwards. I want to know if in this bill there is any provision to take care of those cases?

Mr. SHREVE. I am very happy to say to the gentleman that this bill has provided for that emergency and the Secretary of State can take over those leases and assign them to somebody else.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, that has been recently.

Mr. SHREVE. Just now, as provided in this bill.

Mr. WATSON. There must be a limit, must there not?

Mr. SHREVE. Such limitation as the Secretary of State desires. Of course, the money appropriated to take care of those things will have to be divided equally. It is not a large fund.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For allowance for clerk hire at consulates, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including salary during transit to and from homes in the United States upon beginning and after termination of services, \$1,853,266.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I intended to offer an amendment to this section, as I did last year and the year before, but I have been informed that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has reported a bill which will give a chance to young American citizens to receive employment at these consulates. We have this year a provision that clerks at our embassies and legations must be American citizens, and that is a very wise and wholesome provision. I can not agree with the statement made yesterday by my colleague from New York, the distinguished gentleman on this subcommittee [Mr. Griffin], that citizens are not entirely desirable at consulates. That is not a correct statement, especially at this time when an extraordinary amount of work in connection with visas in conformity with the quota provision of the immigration law has been assigned to our consulates in foreign countries.

There have been some abuses at consulates; there have been complaints and there have been officials dismissed at consulates; but now that we have this immigration work, which brings thousands of people to our consular offices that we did not have before immigration work was put on the consulates, it is absolutely necessary that we have American citizens doing the clerical work at consulates. Why, gentlemen, if you go to the office of the British consul general in New York you will not find anyone doing any clerical work there except British subjects. If you go to the French consulate—and I am not speaking about embassies—and to the German consulate, you will find their own nationals doing the work. I think it is a very small piece of economy to employ aliens at our consulates because we can get them, as the hearings show, for \$900 a year.

This work at the consulates affords a very splendid opportunity for young college men to get experience in our Foreign Service. They can acquire a knowledge of foreign languages just as rapidly and just as well as the nationals or natives of another country can acquire knowledge of the English language while working at our consulates.

We should open the door to these young men and give them an opportunity to go abroad, and we should certainly send out our young men and women as clerks in these various consulates.

Mr. DICKSTEIN and Mr. LINTHICUM rose.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact that in at least five or six countries in Europe conditions are rather horrible as a result of employing the natives of that particular community, resulting in hardships to American citizens who travel abroad?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman is quite right, and at certain consulates these native clerks are very abusive to the people who come there; their own natives, if you please. This does not represent the spirit of America, and this is the immigrant's first contact with any branch of the American Government.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope rather than retrench, the appropriation will be increased. We have an increase in the allowance this year, as I have noticed from the hearings, and that is very wise and necessary.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I served in the American Consular Service five years, and when I resigned from the service I was so broke that I had to work my way home on a steamer. Of course, now we provide for travel pay and it is a real service. I can talk rather feelingly on this subject, and I want to say the five years I had in the service were very useful to me. I had the opportunity of learning foreign languages and getting some business experience. I gave in return, I hope, useful and good services. It is a splendid opening for young college men and women, and I am glad we have an increased appropriation here, and I do hope we will get favorable action on the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and give this chance to many young American citizens.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from New York, I wish to say that the committee this year visited 9 different countries and 28 different cities where we have consulates, and I want to inform the gentleman that there is not one single boy in the United States who would go to Europe and accept any position that is offered there that is now filled by an alien at a salary of \$970, which is the highest salary any of them receives.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is just my point. It is a disgrace we should pay such a low salary and bring about a low standard of living in our own offices.

Mr. SHREVE. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Does he want to convey charwomen across the Atlantic to work in these offices? Does the gentleman want to take in janitors or window washers or employees of that type?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. A clerk is not a charwoman or a window washer. No; I do not want to take in a window washer or a charwoman or a valet, but I want to take in clerks; yes.

Mr. SHREVE. I also found another thing. Many of these clerks are of the greatest value to the United States. They are loyal to the last degree. They speak various languages and act as interpreters and are of great help. I do not know that I would want to run one of these offices without having the assistance of some of these foreign clerks.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There is nothing about a language that one can not acquire. I was raised in Arizona and was sent to Hungary. My district covered Croatia, and I learned the Serbian language.

Mr. SHREVE. I am familiar with a couple of foreign languages myself and know something about that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; there is nothing exclusive about foreign languages.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very glad to hear this discussion about the pay of foreign clerks. I have introduced a bill (H. R. 9110) for the classification and increase of pay of foreign clerks.

This bill has now been favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the report will be in the House in the next day or so.

I can not agree entirely with the gentleman from New York about not having any foreign clerks in the service, because I am informed by Mr. Carr, the Assistant Secretary of State, that it is very essential that we do have some foreign clerks—men who understand the language, understand the manners, and understand the people.

Mr. Carr tells us that these clerks are able to get certain information which is absolutely necessary for the Foreign Service, and that they must be able to mix with the people and know them in order to get such information. I entirely agree with the gentleman that we should have just as few foreign clerks as it is possible for us to have, and in order to do this we must give our own clerks more pay; in fact, we must give the foreign clerks more pay. At the present time a foreign clerk can not receive more than \$1,000 a year, and many of them receive as little as \$720 a year, and quite a number receive even less than that.

This bill of mine will enable young men from this country to take up the Foreign Service and to become clerks in the embassies, legations, and in the consulates.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly.

Mr. SHREVE. I just want to express my great appreciation of what the gentleman is saying. I thoroughly agree with him. I think they ought to have more money and I hope the gentleman's bill passes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I thank the gentleman. I think the bill will commend itself to everybody interested in the welfare of the Foreign Service of our country.

I should like to see the foreign clerks get enough money so we can have young American men go into the service and eventually reach the career service, and I believe this bill will eventually do this. The bill will not only do this but it will also enable us to give better pay to the foreign clerks, who are now working for less than they could obtain from commercial work or even in some of the departments of our own Government. I hope the time may come, as I said, when we will have as many of our own people at the consulates, embassies, and legations as possible and as few alien clerks as we can get along with and as are necessary. We must give them more pay, we must give them a chance for advancement, and this bill of mine will give them a career and enable them to enter the service as a life work. [Applause.]

In the testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee, as I recall it, there are 2,113 clerks in the Foreign Service. Of this number, 757 are Americans.

Under a bill passed in 1906 no clerk of a foreign national can be employed receiving over \$1,000 salary. The result is that all these clerks of foreign nations get less than \$1,000, and the general average among them does not seem to be more than \$750. Note that the law passed in 1906 prohibiting the payment of foreign clerks not more than \$1,000 is some 24 years old, during which time the cost of living must have increased threefold. It was possible at the time the law was passed to get a very good clerk of another nation at that sum, but to-day it is quite impossible to do so. The good clerks of the service of foreign nationals are those who have been holding on, hoping that Congress would eventually do the right thing by them. They can certainly not hold on much longer.

Now, as to the American clerks, my bill would remove the \$1,000 restriction for foreign nationals and would grade and classify the clerical force at rates of compensation as follows: \$4,000, \$3,750, \$3,500, \$3,250, \$3,000, \$2,750, \$2,500—further classification below \$2,500 in the discretion of the Secretary of State.

To adjust salaries in countries where the cost of living is unusual and excessive my bill provides:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, at posts where in his judgment it is required by the public interests for the purpose of meeting the unusual or excessive costs of living ascertained by him to exist, to grant compensation to clerks assigned there in addition to the basic rates herein specified, within such appropriations as Congress may make for such purpose: *Provided, however*, That all such additional compensation with the reasons therefor shall be reported to Congress with the annual Budget.

Perhaps it is not generally known, but the truth is the salaries are so small that the Government does not want to employ clerks for the foreign service who are married, because it is quite impossible for two to live on the salary on which they must begin. This is quite a commentary on a great Government like ours.

The State Department is limited, as I have said, in the payment of clerks of foreign nations, and, strange to say, there is no limitation on any other department of our Government as to such salaries. I will not say more at this time and am only saying this as an advance word on my bill, which I hope will soon come before you. I trust I shall have the support of the House when it is reached. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### IMMIGRATION OF ALIENS

To enable the Department of State to perform the duties devolving upon it under the laws regulating immigration of aliens into the United States, including the same objects specified in the acts making appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1931, under the heads of salaries and contingent expenses of the Department of State, salaries of Foreign Service officers, allowance for clerk hire at United States consulates, transportation of diplomatic and consular officers and clerks, and contingent expenses, United States consulates, \$600,000, of which not to exceed \$37,640 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It seems to me that the House should acquaint itself with the foreign situation more fully. There ought to be a different system installed in a number of the consulates.

In a number of cases in Poland and Latvia, particularly Latvia, men were sent for, for the purpose of securing a non-quota status as ministers of the gospel or any other religious denomination. After they got there, the consul representing the American Government would say:

Well, minister, you stay here and we will make an investigation and see whether or not the people whom you are going to connect with will look after you.

So the investigation is sent on to the State Department, and by the slow process of operation it takes another month or two. In the meantime the minister has practically to support himself up to the last dollar he has. After six or eight months—and in a number of cases almost a year and a half—the minister is informed that the consul and the State Department, particularly the consul who has too much discretion, says: "You can not go, for I am not satisfied that this church or synagogue that you are going to connect yourself with will look after you."

What happens? The man has spent every dollar that he has. He can not go anywhere; he is a man without a country.

This investigation in most cases is a farce. The consul is particularly directed by the general instruction circular, No. 926, which I have in my hands, to expedite applications for nonquota visas of ministers. Instead of that, a great deal of pettifoggery and chicanery is resorted to before a minister is permitted to depart to this country.

There are hundreds of instances continually coming to my attention about this situation. The official instructions prohibit a consul from accepting a nonquota application, unless he is convinced that the grounds therefor are valid. So far, so good. But in cases which are doubtful, the immigrant should be permitted to set forth on the face of the application his reasons, if any, for claiming nonquota status. (Sec. 104 of Regulations.) It is under this section that great abuses have crept in and without any rhyme or reason and without any justification for such action, consuls are continually tempted to reject bona fide applications made by ministers for admission to the United States, without proper legal reasons therefor.

It seems to me that consuls ought to use some discretion and intelligence before they send for a man, particularly a minister of the gospel who is not coming here for any business purpose. He is not interfering with our immigration policy, and the least they can do, certainly, is not to send for the minister until they make the investigation and determine whether or not he is qualified under the immigration act.

If they do that it will avoid hardships of the worst character. To-day there are at least six or eight ministers waiting at Riga as a result of this foolish system that has been conducted by the consul. He brought the men from all parts of the world and keeps them there and it takes months to investigate, and then he says that he is not satisfied. It seems that the consul bosses the State Department and does not want to recognize the principles laid down by his superior officers.

This entire situation which gives discretionary powers to consuls in matters affecting immigration deserves careful looking into.

Perhaps it will be necessary after a while to designate special quota officers to each consulate, for the purpose of having such officers act on immigration applications. I am aware of the fact that the consuls had this work of issuing immigration visas thrust at them without any preparation and that most of them are not properly equipped to handle immigration visa applications.

But when this country embarked on the policy of issuing immigration visas it should have provided for the proper enforcement of this provision of law by proper officers who know their business and who can intelligently attend to it.

Instances like the one mentioned by me are numerous. Not a day passes without some complaint, addressed not so much to the power of consuls who refuse to grant visas in proper cases, but to their general abusive power, and it seems that foreign clerks attached to the consulates are the worse culprits in that respect. Their treatment of applicants is harsh, unjust, no regard is paid to their legitimate wishes or desires, and any investigation which should be made in conformity of the law is carried out in a spirit of enmity to the applicant and officiousness carried to the highest degree.

I am addressing my remarks to the committee, and will perhaps succeed in getting this body interested in the necessity of overhauling this entire consular machinery, so as to provide

that it run smoothly, efficiently, taking care of deserving cases, and weeding out any undesirable applications in a spirit of fairness, worthy of this great country which these consuls represent abroad, and worthy of the name and fame of America.

I hope the committee may see its way to clear the atmosphere, and I should be glad to give concrete cases where men are penalized as the result of this particular act. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The conditions described by the gentleman from New York emphasizes the need of having responsible American citizens at these offices where there is a tremendous amount of immigration work.

In the first place, we have no control or check on the employees of the consulate for misconduct if they are not citizens of the United States. All we can do is to discharge them.

The trouble is that there have been so many thousands of cases in each one of these small offices that it is impossible for the American consul or his deputy to give these thousands of cases their personal attention. The result is that you have aliens—nationals of the foreign country, where the American consulate is located—passing upon these important questions of immigration. The only contact that the prospective alien has is with an official of the consulate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact that ninety out of one hundred times they do not give the alien a chance to see the consul?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They never do.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And he is taken care of by so-called local natives who are connected with the American consulate?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And the same thing applies to some American citizens who, in order to see the consul, have to pass through a lot of red tape before they can see him.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, what is the quota from Riga?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That takes in all of Russia.

Mr. COLE. What is the quota from Russia?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Twenty-seven hundred and odd.

Mr. COLE. There are thousands of them already on the quota list.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly, but we are not discussing that.

Mr. COLE. It ought not to be necessary to examine all of the applicants.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The ministers to whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] refers are nonquota, and the wives of citizens are nonquota, and then we have the fathers and mothers, the preferential ones.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And the professors of colleges and seminaries.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There are a great many exceptions. This is not the time or the place to complain of the law. We are complaining about the administration of the existing law, of the discourteous treatment on the part of cheap alien employees—non-American citizens—employed at the American consulates. It is disgraceful, and you can not justify it.

Mr. Chairman, you ought to see some of the cheap stationery, the dirty paper used to communicate information on immigration, often with misspelled English words, and circulars that are sent out by some of these consulates. I have seen circulars sent out by consulates that are written on cheap butcher wrapping paper. Surely the United States Government does not want to justify the use of anything like that.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Perhaps that is part of our economy program.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not know what it is, but it is unbecoming and unseemly. We are not complaining now of the American consuls. We have a splendid set of men, but they can not possibly attend to all of these details connected with the work of immigration. But we do say that the clerks, the persons coming in contact with these people, should be American citizens who know the language, who are responsible; who, if they take any remuneration or tips from an alien, we can haul back here and punish. You can not do that with this cheap labor that you have, paying them \$970 a year and letting them pass upon questions of human rights.

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, the gentleman knows that that cheap labor is not passing on the question of human rights.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is our complaint—that they are.

Mr. SHREVE. But they are not.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They are; and that is just our complaint.

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman is mistaken; but I am very glad that the gentleman has brought this up, because this committee has increased the appropriations for clerk hire to a

large extent, and I think from now on the gentleman will not have any occasion to complain, even if the statements now are justified.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. We increased it to \$105,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. How much is it increased in this appropriation bill?

Mr. SHREVE. We are doing all of these things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the traveling expenses of Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers, and other employees of the Foreign Service, including officers of the United States Court for China, and the itemized and verified statements of the actual and necessary expenses of transportation and subsistence, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, of their families and effects, in going to and returning from their posts, including not to exceed \$110,000 incurred in connection with leaves of absence, and of the preparation and transportation of the remains of those officers and said employees of the Foreign Service, who have died or may die abroad or in transit while in the discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant for interment and for the ordinary expenses of such interment, \$510,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available also for the authorized expenses of the judge and district attorney of the United States Court for China while attending sessions of the court at other cities than Shanghai, not to exceed \$8 per day each, and for the authorized subsistence expenses of consular and Foreign Service officers while on temporary detail under commission.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether I am correct in my assumption that the total amount of increase provided in the way of salaries for Foreign Service approximates \$1,500,000?

Mr. SHREVE. About that; yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman please advise whether or not there is any increase in the personnel?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes. The personnel is increased all the way through the bill in the Department of State.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does that increase in the personnel account for the increase in salaries, or is that both an increase in salary and in personnel?

Mr. SHREVE. Both. We have taken care of the salary matter and also of the personnel.

Mr. KETCHAM. That was leading up directly to the question I had in mind. I notice there is an increase in the item of \$100,000 for transportation. Naturally with the personnel remaining constant—

Mr. SHREVE. We would not need that, but with a larger force we have to have more money.

Mr. KETCHAM. And this means that the \$100,000 provided here over and above the transportation provided in last year's bill accounts for the additional personnel.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. It provides for 67 additional Foreign Service officers. Necessarily their traveling expenses to some extent must go along with it.

Mr. KETCHAM. And that is looking forward somewhat to this idea of employing more Americans in the consulates?

Mr. SHREVE. We would be very happy if we did not find ourselves obliged to hire foreign people.

Mr. KETCHAM. I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the explanation contained in the colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] and the chairman of the subcommittee prompts me to withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the reservation of the point of order. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of the quota of the United States for the support of the Pan American Union, \$147,219.60, and for printing and binding of the union, \$20,000; in all \$167,219.60.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the chairman kindly inform the committee as to the total expense that is involved in the maintenance of the Pan American Union? We contribute under this

paragraph \$167,219.60. What proportion of the total expense is our contribution?

Mr. SHREVE. I regret to say that I am unable to give the total expense, because we are simply paying our proportionate part of whatever it is. The 21 American Republics maintain the Pan American Union, and every one of those Republics contributes its proportionate share according to population. The latest estimate of our population, as furnished by the census, is 122,000,000 inhabitants. That is of June 30, 1929. The appropriation for the Pan American Union that we made for the current fiscal year is \$167,219.60.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I assume that all the countries in the union are paying their contributing share.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. They are paying their share, and they are very happy to do so. It brings the people of the United States and Central and South America together more closely, and the result is very satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To meet the share of the United States in the expenses for the calendar year 1929 of the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, created under article 43 of the convention concluded at The Hague, October 18, 1907, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, \$2,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are we to understand from the paragraph last read that our annual contribution in support of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague is only \$2,000?

Mr. SHREVE. That is our assessment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would our share of the expense be greater if we were a recognized member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration?

Mr. SHREVE. Possibly; I imagine so.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am just advised privately by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] that this is not the Court of Arbitration but merely the International Bureau connected with the court.

Mr. SHREVE. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. And we are not contributing anything to the support of the Permanent Court of Arbitration?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This is the court established many years ago, back in 1897, which has not been actually functioning much during the last few years, since the Court of International Justice has been projected.

Mr. STAFFORD. And if we were members of the Court of International Justice our expense would be much larger, and probably a proportionate part of the expense of that institution?

Mr. SHREVE. This is simply a record office of the Court of Arbitration. It is something like a clerk's office—to keep the records.

Mr. STAFFORD. Somewhat perfunctory in its character?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of the quota of the United States, including the Territory of Hawaii, and the dependencies of the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the support of the International Institute of Agriculture for the calendar year 1931, \$9,600;

For the cost of translating into and printing in the English language the publications of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, \$2,000;

For clerical assistance and traveling and office expenses, \$3,660;

Total, \$15,260.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the chairman to this paragraph and to direct a question to him concerning it. I notice in the statement as to the appropriation for last year that \$58,000 was included, and that the Budget estimate for the next year, 1931, for which we are now appropriating, is \$23,000, and that the committee recommended a sum less than that by \$8,000. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to make a statement, if he will, as to

the reason that impelled the committee to take that action respecting this institution, to which heretofore we have given our approbation and enthusiastic support.

Mr. SHREVE. I shall be glad to answer the gentleman from Michigan if I can. We have reduced this appropriation this year by \$7,850. We have made the reduction because we have been unable to reach any sort of satisfactory agreement with constituted authorities as to the conduct of the institution, and we think our Government should not continue to pay the extraordinary portion that we pay. Unless the treaty is denounced, we should pay our proportion, but we think that the institution is not doing the work it should do and that the United States is not receiving the benefit it should receive.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the candor of the chairman of the committee in making this statement. I hope it will be borne in mind later when we take up for consideration again a bill that has been passed by the House several times, but which failed in another body, looking to the development of our foreign agricultural service. In previous years we have been depending a great deal on information from this International Institute of Agriculture. I hope, considering the statement that the gentleman has made, that the House will give the same enthusiastic support to the bill I referred to that was manifested in the preceding actions of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for necessary special or technical investigations in connection with the authorized work of the International Joint Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, traveling expenses, procurement of technical and scientific equipment, and the purchase, exchange, hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, \$131,230, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State, who is authorized to transfer to any department or independent establishment of the Government, with the consent of the head thereof, any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or establishment for the purposes of this appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I notice there has been considerable change in the phraseology and rearrangement of the clauses in the pending paragraph over that carried in existing law; also, quite a decided increase in appropriation. I believe last year the amount carried was \$75,000 as compared with \$131,230 in this year's bill. First, has there been any additional authority vested in the International Joint Commission by the change of phraseology?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no. This is merely to bring these items together where they may be passed upon at one time, so as to avoid complications in filing accounts with the comptroller and others.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, next, what is the occasion for the increased appropriation? Is that due merely to the merger of items of appropriation? If my notes are correct, in last year's act we appropriated \$75,000 while in this year's bill it is proposed to appropriate \$131,230, almost a 100 per cent increase. I am in sympathy with the work of this commission, as I believe it involves the determination of questions relating to the great St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman that these expenditures really come under two treaties. For instance, I will refer to things that are pending at the present time: Trail Smelter reference; Roseau River reference; Rainy Lake reference; St. Mary and Milk Rivers apportionment; West Kootenay Power & Light Co.; and many things of that kind which occasion the increase. These studies have all come up during the last 2, 3, or 4 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I infer from the gentleman's statement, this increase is more seasonal than it will be continuous.

Mr. SHREVE. I imagine it will not be continuous, because as soon as these studies are taken care of that ends it, unless there is some new matter presented.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish the gentleman to go into it at length, but do the hearings disclose the progress of the work of the commission so far as the St. Lawrence waterway is concerned?

Mr. SHREVE. Well, no. I can only say this: That the regular work has been maintained along the St. Lawrence by the commission that has been maintained for a number of years, but as far as the proposed international waterway is concerned I am unable to give the gentleman any information because there is nothing in this bill which covers that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MIXED CLAIMS COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GERMANY—AND TRIPARTITE CLAIMS COMMISSION, UNITED STATES, AUSTRIA, AND HUNGARY

For the expenses of determining the amounts of claims against Germany by the Mixed Claims Commission established under the agreement concluded between the United States and Germany on August 10, 1922, and subsequent agreement between those Governments, for the determination of the amount to be paid by Germany in satisfaction of the financial obligations of Germany under the treaty concluded between the Governments of the United States and Germany on August 25, 1921, for the expenses of determining the amounts of claims against Austria and Hungary by the Tripartite Claims Commission established under the agreement concluded between the United States and Austria and Hungary on November 26, 1924, for the determination of the amount to be paid by Austria and Hungary in satisfaction of the financial obligations of Austria and Hungary under the treaties concluded between the Governments of the United States and Austria on August 24, 1921, and between the Governments of the United States and Hungary on August 29, 1921, and/or the treaties of St. Germain-Laye and Trianon, respectively, including the expenses which under the terms of such agreement of August 10, 1922, and the agreement of November 26, 1924, are chargeable in part to the United States; and the expenses of an agency of the United States to perform all necessary services in connection with the preparation of claims and the presentation thereof before said mixed and tripartite commissions, including salaries of an agent and necessary counsel and other assistants and employees, rent in the District of Columbia, employment of special counsel, translators, and other technical experts, by contract, without regard to the provisions of any statute relative to employment, and for contract stenographic reporting services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), law books and books of reference, contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and such other expenses in the United States and elsewhere as the President may deem proper, \$125,075.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last figure. I think the committee and the country would be interested in having a summary statement as to the progress which has been made in the settlement of the claims pending between the United States and Germany and also between the United States and Austria-Hungary. I am quite sure the hearings give that information and will not impose too great a burden upon the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHREVE. I am very happy to do so. The Mixed Claims Commission is getting along splendidly and we have been able to reduce their appropriation this year by \$7,000. That is a reduction for 1931, and it is understood that at the end of 1931 the work of that commission will have ceased. This current year, however, they ask for a supplemental appropriation of about \$28,000, I think, because of some additional work which the commission has had to take on in disposing of belated claims that were not filed at the original time for the reception of claims.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that the work had virtually been completed or was nearing completion.

Mr. SHREVE. The commission feel that they are going to clean this work up by the end of 1931, and I presume this will be the last appropriation we will have. The Mixed Claims Commission was organized pursuant to the joint resolution of July 2, 1921, terminating the war between the United States and Germany, the treaty of August 25, 1921, between the United States and Germany, and the agreement entered into August 10, 1922, between the United States and Germany, for the adjudication and settlement of the claim of the United States and of American nationals. The appropriation is necessary for that commission and to meet the expense of the Tripartite Claims Commission which was organized under a treaty concluded between the United States and Austria on August 24, 1921, and between the United States and Hungary on August 29, 1921, for the purpose of settling the obligations and claims arising between the Governments and peoples of these countries.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin permit me to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Then this \$28,000, which will be asked in addition to this appropriation, will be the final expense?

Mr. SHREVE. It is expected that will be the last and final expense. It might be interesting to the committee to know that there were filed with the Mixed Claims Commission more than 12,425 claims under the original agreement of August 10, 1922, the amount claimed approximating \$1,479,000,000. Subsequently there were filed 7,300 additional claims. These additional "late" claims were filed with the Department of State between April 9,

1923, and July 1, 1928. The added work of handling these "late" claims will make necessary a deficiency appropriation for the current year of 1930 amounting to \$28,833, which is being requested through the Bureau of the Budget for inclusion in the first deficiency bill.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. And that will end the work of the commission?

Mr. SHREVE. We expect that will end the work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think there should be a commendatory word passed upon the work of this Mixed Claims Commission. Invariably it has been the rule that when we create a commission to determine or settle claims the work goes on like water flowing over the rock, unendingly, and they never come to an end. This was the history of the Cuban Claims Commission and the Mexican Claims Commission. They are nice, favorite abodes oftentimes for those select former Members of Congress designated opprobriously as lame ducks.

I believe the payment of these claims is carried as a part of the Young debt settlement, and everything is amicably arranged for the payment of the debt as adjudicated by this commission between our Government and Germany.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the expenses of the settlement and adjustment of claims by the citizens of each country against the other under a convention concluded September 8, 1923, and of citizens of the United States against Mexico under a convention concluded September 10, 1923, between the United States and Mexico, including the expenses which, under the terms of the two conventions, are chargeable in part to the United States, the expenses of the two commissions, and the expenses of an agency of the United States to perform all necessary services in connection with the preparation of the claims and the presenting thereof before the said commissions, as well as defending the United States in cases presented under the general convention by Mexico, including salaries of an agent and necessary counsel and other assistants and employees and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, law books and books of reference, printing and binding, contingent expenses, contract stenographic reporting services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), the employment of special counsel, translators, and other technical experts, by contract, without regard to the provisions of any statute relative to employment, traveling expenses, and such other expenses in the United States and elsewhere as the President may deem proper, \$350,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of securing some information from the committee.

This commission, known as the Joint and Special Claims Commission, is the commission that is investigating the claims of citizens of the United States and also the claims of citizens of Mexico.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The amount of the bill, of course, is for the expenses of the commission and will not be expended, any portion of it, in the payment of any of these claims.

Mr. SHREVE. No; not a cent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the committee able to inform us about when these claims that have been allowed by the commission will be paid? Has the gentleman any information on that? I will say to the gentleman I have had criticism from some people in Texas who have had claims pending for quite a while, some of which have been allowed, and I was wondering if the committee could give us any information about the probable time when these claims that have been allowed will be paid.

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman that there were so many claims that were not presented on time that we found it necessary to continue the work of the commission for a certain period of time, and nothing is going to be paid until it is all settled, which we hope will be in the very near future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Some of these claims have been allowed for quite a long while and bear no interest, and it hardly seems fair that the claimants who have established the justness of their claim should have to wait until all the claims have been passed on.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, that is a matter that can not be controlled by our Government alone.

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is a matter of mutual arrangement and agreement, and in this connection, as I understand it, there has been a recent convention or renewal of a former convention under which the work, which for a time was rather lagging, has again been taken up with the hope of as early a conclusion as possible.

Mr. SHREVE. Really, we must take into consideration somewhat the financial condition of our neighbors. We are not pressing them at this time. To date the total awards in favor of the United States aggregate \$2,512,121.18.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is that the total of the claims allowed?

Mr. SHREVE. The awards up to the present time, and there is interest on that amount of \$542,668. Now, listen to this. The total awards in favor of Mexico aggregate only \$39,000, with no interest allowed. So the gentleman can see how overwhelming it is on one side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is pay day dependent on the time when Mexico is able to pay?

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. We still have to wait for Mexico before the whole matter may be settled. It is an international matter.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the total claims against the United States amount to over \$2,000,000?

Mr. SHREVE. No; the awards against Mexico amount to over \$2,000,000 and the awards against the United States amount to \$39,000.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I am noticing the relatively large amount of appropriation in respect to these claims, \$350,000.

Mr. SHREVE. This is to take care of the office force, the gathering of information, and the dissemination of it. Another difficulty is that when you go down to Mexico to examine a title or to do any research work, or to find out the facts relative to a particular claim, it is almost an endless proposition, and necessarily it costs more money. It is not like it is in the United States courts.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman answer a further question? How does this appropriation compare with the appropriation for the commission in past years?

Mr. SHREVE. About the same.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. How many years has the commission been in existence—since 1923?

Mr. SHREVE. Six years, I think.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that if we would contribute direct to the payment of these claims the amount of money that we are appropriating every year for the expense of the commission, \$350,000, which is a tidy sum, there would be better prospect of these claimants getting something substantial than if we wait upon the action of the Republic of Mexico?

Mr. SHREVE. I am sure the gentleman does not care to embarrass the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under no circumstances would I desire to embarrass the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. But I do wish to say that by reason of our relations with Mexico being so harmonious at the present time, through the great services of Ambassador Morrow, there is much more prospect of these claims being adjudicated amicably, and perhaps some adjustment made than there has been in the past, when our relations were not as cordial as they are to-day.

Mr. SHREVE. It will really soon be over now. I did not state that there is a limitation of two years. A further extension of two years was signed by the two countries under date of September 2, 1929, and ratifications were exchanged October 15, 1929.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then we will know very shortly whether we are going to get anything or not?

Mr. SHREVE. I think so.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

The Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: To enable the Secretary of State to pay the annual contribution of the United States to the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, as provided by the act approved May 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 491), \$50,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I recall distinctly the act of 1928, when we appropriated for this memorial laboratory. I notice that the hearings are not very extensive; can the gentleman inform us what has been accomplished, and if any of the Latin-American countries have, or are likely to agree, to help support the institution? Or is it a purely American proposition?

Mr. SHREVE. It is to be carried on by the United States, stimulated by a fund authorized to be contributed by the Gov-

ernments of Latin-American countries in the act which created it.

Mr. WATSON. Is it now a going institution?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. What is the nature of the cases?

Mr. SHREVE. Every class of case that requires scientific inquiry.

Mr. WATSON. Have they gone so far as to make a serum?

Mr. SHREVE. I can not answer the gentleman for I do not know. I will say to the gentleman that its organization contemplates two principal lines of operation—one for the dissemination and popularization of health and sanitary work in the United States, supplemental to governmental health activities; and the other for the intensive study in the Tropics of the causes and prevention of disease. The first-named phase is understood to be already well organized and the other phase will now be undertaken under the authority of the act above cited and by means of the funds thereby authorized and the supplementing funds which may be contributed by the Governments of the Latin-American countries, as authorized and invited by the act. The two phases of work will be kept entirely distinct each from the other, both as to operation and finances.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of the judge, district attorney, and other officers and employees of the court; court expenses, including reference law books, ice, and drinking water for office purposes, \$41,650.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I find here an appropriation for reference law books for the court in China. Then I find ice and drinking water. I would like to know if this is cracked ice or cube ice.

Mr. SHREVE. Shaved ice.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That goes well with mint juleps.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is appropriated for the maintenance of the United States Court in China \$41,650 and only \$9,600 for the support of prisoners.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We ought not to have any prisoners in China; we have enough of our own.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. But the gentleman must remember we have extraterritorial rights there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand that. They tell me that in the Orient it is necessary to have water; but they tell me that they have to blend the water with something in order to keep off the tropical diseases. [Laughter.] Is there sufficient in this appropriation to keep our judge and district attorney healthy and sober?

Mr. SHREVE. I wish to say that the water situation in China is different from that at home. When I was there the water was served in bottles. The water came from the mountains and is carbonated. It is sparkling drinking water. This is to take care of the health of the officers and the officials of the United States, and, of course, they have to furnish them ice.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am glad that the Appropriations Committee has furnished sufficient bottle supplies for the court in China. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say to the gentleman for the benefit of the ultradry from the Wolverine State that the eighteenth amendment does not apply in China.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Hence the ice and bottled water. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHREVE. Everything is extraterritorial out there and you may do as you please.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think the time is soon coming when we will no longer have this item in the appropriation bill. I believe the administration has made great progress in cooperation with the Nationalist Government of China, to do away with these extraterritorial courts. It is time that they were done away with. Time and time again we have promised the Chinese Government that we would not insist on extraterritorial rights. A great many of the other powers have withdrawn their claims. This system of extraterritorial rights is an invasion of the sovereignty of China, and we will accomplish a great deal for the peace of the world if we do away with them. A great movement sprung up among the Chinese people, under the inspiration of Dr. Sun Yat Sen, which had for its main objective the removal of foreign courts, the removal of foreign privileges. This movement was successful. Generally the Chinese people were back of it and supported it.

It won out, and it created a government—a government that had some fine notions for the progressive development of China, but all of the time these extraterritorial courts stood in the way of Chinese progress. We, at the Washington conference, together with other powers, agreed that in time we would with-

draw this jurisdiction. We have always said that China is a sovereign country, and at the same time we have denied to China one of the main rights of sovereignty, and that is control within its own geographical borders of its own subjects and of foreigners who happen to live there. This House passed the Porter resolution a few years ago by a vote of almost 3 to 1, urging immediate withdrawal of these extraterritorial courts. The administration did a great deal along that line by the removal from China of a nonsympathetic diplomat. I regret that the London parley has not taken up this question. If we remove these courts, and the other powers do the same, China can put herself on a firm basis. China can then develop. One of the great irritations of the East, the uncertainty in China, will then be removed. One of the great causes for war, one of the great possibilities leading up to conflagration in the Far East will then be removed. All we are doing is maintaining courts there to try a few divorce cases, to try a few men who run counter to the ideas of peace-loving Chinese, and who insist on being tried in our courts. I think the day is coming soon when we will no longer have this item in the appropriation bill, and I believe the House will be in accord with the elimination of this insistence that we keep our nose in Chinese affairs. I am quite sure that we would not want the Chinese to maintain courts in this country. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of law books, books of reference, and periodicals, including the exchange thereof, for the Department of Justice, \$7,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2 per volume shall be paid for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask a question about this \$2 per volume limitation for the purchase of the United States Code. Is that the cost of the publication, can it be obtained for that, or is this simply prohibitory?

Mr. SHREVE. It is not prohibitory. If they can get it for that, they can buy it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I thought it cost more than that?

Mr. BACON. It does; but not for the Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can we get them for that?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. What is the meaning of the expression "including the exchange thereof"?

Mr. SHREVE. Of books?

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Yes.

Mr. SHREVE. It sometimes happens that you will have a chance to trade in some old volumes for new volumes. Sometimes a publisher will come along and be willing to trade a set of new books and take the old ones in exchange. That happens sometimes. That, however, does not apply to the Agricultural Yearbook, some one suggests.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Detection and prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of criminal identification and other records and their exchange with the officials of States, cities, and other institutions; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General; hire, maintenance, upkeep, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; firearms and ammunition, such stationery and supplies for use at the seat of government or elsewhere as the Attorney General may direct, including not to exceed \$10,000 for taxicab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this paragraph and to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General; traveling expenses; and payment of rewards when specifically authorized by the Attorney General for information leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice, including not to exceed \$341,546 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$2,781,419.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer to amend, on page 34, line 24, after the words "and other," by inserting the word "criminal," so that it will read "criminal identification and other criminal records."

If the gentleman will remember, a few days ago we passed a bill. There was a committee amendment adding "other records," and also there was an amendment made on the floor, offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. LAGUARDIA, to insert the word "criminal." If you do not do that, you have the section different from the bill that was passed by the House.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My recollection is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] suggested the word "crime" rather than the word "criminal." I observed afterwards in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the word "criminal" was used. I do not know what word actually was incorporated in the bill that was sent to the Senate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. WATSON. Here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the amendment was to insert after the word "other" the word "criminal."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I observed that, but I remember distinctly that the gentleman from New York suggested the word "crime" rather than the word "criminal," and there was a distinction made at the time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly; and I intended to make that distinction. I think the bill is properly amended.

Mr. SHREVE. Does the gentleman think that this language is not sufficient?

Mr. WATSON. I think it ought to be exactly like the language in the bill that we passed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I suggest that the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw his amendment, so that we can really ascertain just how the bill reads now, and then we can put in the proper word at the proper time in the other body.

Mr. SHREVE. I am unable to see at the present time just why the bill is not satisfactory. I am sure that any lawyer would construe it to cover the whole situation.

Mr. WATSON. I think the appropriation bill should be just as the House bill 977 was passed.

Mr. SHREVE. I think we ought to have an opportunity to take it up later.

Mr. WATSON. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment for further consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last figure. I notice that there is an increase in this item of almost a half million dollars for the detection and prosecution of crime. I suppose that is a deserved increase?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give to the House what this paragraph carried in the appropriation bill, say, 10 years ago, to show the increase that has grown up in the last decade?

Mr. SHREVE. I am happy to say that I can give that information. Ten years ago it was \$2,725,000, but the gentleman must remember that there have been numerous acts passed by the Congress since that time which would naturally increase the amount. There is, for instance, the Dyer Act and the narcotic act, and there are four or five other acts that have brought about a larger amount of work in this department.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the reason for the unusual increase this year of nearly half a million dollars?

Mr. SHREVE. It is due to the increase of the business. It is everywhere. The demand upon this bureau for assistance comes from every part of the United States. The young man at the head of the bureau, to my mind, is conducting the bureau very much better than it has ever been done before. He is an active man, and the situation is covered by these men all over the United States. He has come to the point where he does not accept anybody as an agent unless he is a lawyer. It takes a fine lawyer when he is starting out. We are very much pleased with the work of that department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EXAMINATION OF JUDICIAL OFFICES

Examination of judicial offices: For the investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, and clerks of the United States courts and Territorial courts, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the official papers, records, and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney General at any time; and also, when requested by the presiding judge, the official acts, records, and accounts of referees and trustees of such courts; for copying, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, reports of examiners at folio rates; traveling expenses; and including not to exceed \$49,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; in all, \$170,000; to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On page 35, line 18, after the words "accounts of" insert the word "judges" and a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: On page 35, line 18, after the words "accounts of," insert the word "judges."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I hope to have the sympathetic attention of the Committee on Appropriations on this amendment. In all likelihood there will be no need to avail ourselves of the change made by my amendment, but if an occasion should arise it is extremely necessary.

Let me give an instance. At the last Congress I personally called on the Attorney General for the use and advantage of these 42 agents covered in this section in an inquiry as to certain charges concerning the actions of a judge.

The Attorney General replied that he did not think he could do so on his own initiative, but he could do it if a committee made that request. Then he found he could not under the law detail any man to investigate these acts. Then we had to pass a resolution in the House, and then go to the Attorney General, and he employed these agents without pay, and when they completed their work they were returned to that department.

Now, I submit that under our Government all this procedure should not be necessary. I see no reason why in our action respecting a certain judge, when we call upon the department to use these agents and accountants who have experience as investigators to check up on the action of the judge—I see no reason why we should not be able to obtain that service. It should be done, of course, under proper circumstances. The Department of Justice is the only branch of our Government that is entirely aloof and not subject to any check up. That is our Department of Justice. It is extremely difficult to invoke the machinery provided under the Constitution to remove a judge.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. That is because under the Constitution they have a life tenure of office. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question: If you add additional work to that department and it is called upon to perform it under the appropriation provided, then what?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The procedure should be to let the Attorney General know that in a proper case, where there is a resolution of investigation, or a resolution of impeachment, if you please, we may call upon him to use the machinery and men in his department to check up as to the information the committee may want.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. That is the only place you can go to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. I hope the committee will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment, if it belongs anywhere, should be under "Investigation and prosecution of crimes." This item simply applies to the examination of judicial officers, not as to the conduct of judges. It is simply intended to go into the courts and examine the state of affairs in those courts—in the offices of those courts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is the examination of the official acts of the courts.

Mr. SHREVE. It has to do with the collection and application of fees, and things like that. This does not belong to the judges at all. It is getting a good way from the purposes and intentions of the act, which provides that on certain occasions these men may go about the country and examine those offices and see that in every way they are complying with the practices prescribed for those offices. It does not apply to the judges.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, including experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, including not to exceed \$55,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$203,600.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: Page 36, line 10, after the word "Columbia," strike out the figures "\$203,600" and insert "\$700,000."

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the reason that this is the only bureau having in charge the enforcement of the antitrust laws of the country. For over 40 years the people have been demanding of Congress and of the administrative bureaus the prosecution of those organizations alleged to be committing illegal acts in restraint of trade. Twenty-seven years ago there were appropriated \$500,000 for enforcement of the antitrust laws. That amount has been gradually decreased until now the estimate for the coming year is \$203,600, or the same annual expenditure as has been provided for several years past.

The attorney for the Attorney General's Department appearing before the Appropriations Committee stated that they had been before the Budget Committee and endeavored to get a larger amount because they needed a larger amount for their activities. The Budget Committee declined to increase the amount and the Appropriations Committee, after hearing the same gentleman, has declined to increase the amount. The consequence is that this bill comes in here with practically the same amount to be appropriated for the enforcement of the antitrust laws as we have had in the last 18 or 20 years.

At this time the people of the smaller communities, and larger communities as well, are pleading that some Government agency investigate and prosecute those monopolistic enterprises which are driving the independents from business—such as the chain stores, the group banks, the chain banks, the power trust, and many other organizations of like nature. The people are looking to the Justice Department at this time as never before for the enforcement of the antitrust law provisions.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I would suggest that the gentleman from Wisconsin also include the Industrial Alcohol Trust, which has been so viciously opposing a protective tariff on blackstrap molasses which is advocated by the farmers of America. We have an industrial alcohol monopoly in this country to-day. I have made a study of this situation and know whereof I speak.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. If this amendment shall be adopted, and this increased appropriation allowed to the department, I shall be very pleased to go with the gentleman from Milwaukee to the department and call attention to the action he desires.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the hearings disclose the amount that was recommended to the Budget by the department as sufficient for their activities?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. The hearings do not seem to give the figures.

Mr. SHREVE. I can answer the gentleman. This exact amount was recommended to the Bureau of the Budget. And let me say to the gentleman that last year there was an unexpended balance of \$26,672, so you see they do not need the money. If they had spent their money up to within a few dollars that would have been some indication that they were entitled to more money. But this is all the money they asked for.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This small and constantly dwindling appropriation requested for the enforcement of the antitrust laws might be an indication upon the part of the powers and authorities that they do not want them to fully perform their duties in this regard.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, the gentleman can draw his own conclusion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am basing my statement upon the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, that there is a great demand upon the part of the people out in his section of the country that there be greater activity on the part of this department, but the people representing the department say they can not carry on greater enforcement without adequate appropriations.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. That is very true. If I may proceed for just a moment, I would state that the explanation given by the chairman is partly true. They did not ask for more, but they explained that they needed more; that they had dispensed with the services of several men and that they had gotten rid of a certain number of bureaus or clerks in bureaus in order to obtain enough funds to hire special counsel. At this time this particular bureau has 26 cases in the various district courts against large aggregations of capital charged with violating the antitrust law. One is a case against Swift & Co., and there is also a case in the Supreme Court against Swift &

Co. Another case is one against the Great Western Sugar Co. Several other cases of that kind, including a number against moving-picture companies, are now pending and are being prosecuted in the district courts of the United States.

Here we have a bureau with only 20 attorneys in it, the largest salary paid to any attorney being \$7,500, and the larger number of attorneys in that bureau receiving as little as \$2,500 a year. That bureau, and the small appropriation it has to work with in opposition to the unlimited resources of monopolistic combinations, is the response of the Budget Committee and of the Committee on Appropriations to the widespread demand of the people of this country who wish to have some real and active enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. I fully understand the difficulty in having an amendment adopted to an appropriation bill when the committee is opposed to it, but the point I am trying to make is that the people of this country want more action in this particular bureau in the enforcement of the antitrust laws. They want the antitrust laws enforced, and they are demanding it. Yet we are permitting a Budget Committee, and we are permitting people who have not taken into consideration the rights and demands of the people in connection with the enforcement of these laws, to fix the amount which this bill shall carry for that purpose. I understand that the Attorney General has evidenced a desire to have more activity in the prosecution of antitrust law cases. Now, if he desires that—and I have much confidence in the Attorney General—then it seems to me it is time the Congress responded to the demands of the people. Regardless of what some committee may think about the activities of this bureau, they, the people, demand action; and there should be funds provided sufficient to bring about such action.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think this is a rather important matter than the gentleman raises. The gentleman offers an amendment to increase this appropriation some \$500,000. Upon what does the gentleman predicate that figure?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Because they need funds enough for this important purpose. I have no information so as to say how it should be apportioned, and I do not claim to have such knowledge. We have various bureaus of government, and we have our Committee on Appropriations, informed as to details, but they come in here appropriating the same old amount, and the bureau complains that it has not sufficient funds to take care of its activities.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly what I desired to ask the gentleman.

Mr. SHREVE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. There never was such a complaint made to our committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have the floor temporarily.

Mr. SHREVE. But I can not allow that statement to go unchallenged.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. I will read the complaint if the gentleman will give me the opportunity.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understood the gentleman to say that the Department of Justice had requested a larger appropriation than the one carried in the pending bill; is that true?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. I will give the gentleman the testimony taken by the Committee on Appropriations. I was not there. It is in the record, and I presume it is true.

The statement of the representative of the Department of Justice was as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN. We asked the Budget Committee for more money, but they felt it was difficult to forecast what our expenses would be, and declined our request.

I respectfully call the attention of the chairman of the committee to that testimony.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The main object of my inquiry, because I am in sympathy with the purposes expressed by the gentleman, was to find out whether the figure suggested by the gentleman was based approximately upon the recommendation made by the Department of Justice. It is evident from the statement read from the hearing that they did ask for more money, and I now ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he knows and will tell the House how much the Department of Justice requested for this purpose.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; they asked for \$75,000 more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why did not the gentleman's committee give it to them if they said that was necessary?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think this should be said. The Attorney General, as I recall, made reference to this particular appropriation and said that probably he might later have to ask for more money. He did not ask for more money, and perhaps one reason was that we had provided a very large sum for the employment of special attorneys, and under that appropriation he would be authorized to employ special attorneys in cases of importance and regarded as urgent. He can pay as much as \$10,000 to special attorneys in cases where he feels the public interest requires. Had the Attorney General requested that we appropriate at this time more money for antitrust cases, we should gladly have allowed it. He felt that probably it would not be required, but did say, whether it appears in his revised statement or not I am not prepared to say, that he might require more money for this purpose.

If the gentleman will permit, as showing the attitude of the Attorney General on this subject, I will read, with the consent of the gentleman, some excerpts from a speech of the Attorney General delivered at Memphis, Tenn., to the American Bar Association:

When this administration took office, the largest problems confronting the Attorney General were: Improvement and reform in the Federal prison system, and in the related subject of paroles and probation, and improvement in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States, in connection with which the two major problems arise under the national prohibition act and the antitrust laws.

In the first place, let me say that the department's program of law enforcement does not make any exception of the antitrust laws. I have read nothing in the President's inaugural address or in any other of his statements which makes any distinction in the matter of law enforcement between the antitrust laws and any other acts of Congress, and I have received no intimation from any source that the antitrust laws were to be neglected or that violations of those laws were not to be prosecuted with vigor and determination. There have been many changes in economic conditions since these statutes were passed, and much discussion has arisen as to whether some modification of them is desired to meet modern business conditions. The antitrust laws are founded on the proposition that avenues of industrial opportunity must be kept open as far as possible to the initiative of the individual citizen. The alternative is bureaucratic regulation. That is not an attractive alternative. At any rate, until the political philosophy underlying the present antitrust laws has been abandoned by Congress, it will be the duty of the Attorney General to enforce those laws, and we shall undertake to do this without prejudice and with fairness, but with firmness. The Department of Justice is not the place in which to amend the antitrust laws or any other acts of Congress. Changes in business conditions and methods of marketing, vertical trusts, chain stores, and other modern developments have come thick and fast and have been somewhat confusing to those dealing with the antitrust laws, but I have no doubt that the principles contained in these statutes will be intelligently applied by the courts to the modern conditions.

Our material prosperity has been so overwhelming, our business institutions have been increasing in size and number with such leaps and bounds that I fear there has been a disposition here and there to go too far and transgress the law. The machinery of some trade associations seems to have been made use of for transactions that come dangerously near price fixing. With every disposition to refrain from any interference with legitimate business, the antitrust division of the Department of Justice proposes to deal vigorously with every violation of the antitrust laws which comes to its attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will state that the Attorney General impressed at that time on the members of the American Bar Association that the enforcement of the antitrust laws would have, his very careful attention and consideration and he expressed the conviction that there were probably many improper mergers. With this kind of a declaration by the Attorney General, I feel confident he has given special study to this important question, and when he declined to ask at this time for an increase in this appropriation he must have felt the appropriations provided under this head, and for the employment of special counsel, were probably sufficient.

Mr. SHREVE. If I may add a word, the Attorney General said that it was on the theory that "if we need more money later, we can ask for a supplemental appropriation," and this is often done.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is the statement I had reference to a moment ago.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, even if we admit that the Attorney General has not asked for any more money, I am here to say that you have got a very large and important activity in this bureau. There is a wholly insufficient sum provided for that activity, and if you do not provide any more money, you can expect to get any more out of the department, so far as the prosecution of trusts is concerned, than you have been getting in the past.

Whether you adopt this amendment or some other amendment, something ought to be done to bring this bureau into that kind of activity where the people will feel they have some protection against trusts and monopolistic combinations—mergers and the like.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I observed that the gentleman said to his colleague that he would go with him to the department. Is that the way the department ought to be advised as to how the money shall be expended?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. I was merely making a kind offer to the gentleman in case he wanted to go to the department for any reason. I should be pleased to go with him and show him where the department is. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I venture to suggest, if I may, that the proper way is for the department head to determine how the money he needs shall be expended.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the amendment. There seems to be a widespread opposition throughout the country against certain chain institutions which are throttling the little independent merchants, such as the grocer, the meat-market man, and the drug-store operator.

By passing this amendment increasing the appropriation we will serve notice on the Attorney General of the United States that this Congress firmly believes that monopolies violating the antitrust laws should be vigorously prosecuted.

Mr. Chairman, we hear on the floor of this House day in and day out—we hear in other legislative halls—much talk about law enforcement. There are appropriated millions, tens of millions, twenties of millions, to enforce the prohibition laws to prosecute the little fellow and punish him; but you hamstring the Department of Justice when it comes to appropriations with which to prosecute huge monopolies that violate the antitrust laws. I have carefully studied the prohibition question and know that in this Nation to-day we have an Industrial Alcohol Trust, a practical monopoly. We should place in the hands of the Department of Justice sufficient funds so that they can properly tend to the Industrial Alcohol Trust.

Why, gentlemen, talk in favor of law enforcement? Let us not be put in the attitude of talking and practicing law enforcement only for the little fellow. Let us not talk and provide appropriations only when it comes to enforcing the eighteenth amendment and laws enacted thereunder.

Let us take care of the big fellow. Place sufficient funds in the hands of the Attorney General so that he can prosecute big monopolies which violate the antitrust laws. If we can appropriate many millions of dollars to enforce the prohibition law against the little fellow who may be transporting a bottle of nonintoxicating beverage containing 2.75 alcohol by weight, or a small bottle containing a gill of distilled spirits, we ought to be able to place in the hands of the Attorney General sufficient funds to prosecute those who violate the antitrust laws. Pass this amendment and let the country know that we believe in law enforcement, that we believe in enforcing the law against the big monopolies. If the Department of Justice does not use the money they can not pass the buck to Congress and it will not run away from the Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I had an amendment prepared to this section of the appropriation bill increasing the figure from \$203,600 to \$503,600. I will not offer my amendment because I think this amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] covers the same purpose and is more liberal along these lines.

I think \$203,600 is entirely inadequate for investigation and work in enforcing the antitrust laws in the United States. This is especially true in view of the fact that \$55,000 of the proposed appropriation is for use in the District of Columbia, leaving only \$148,600 for use all over the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there is no single item in this appropriation bill which deals with a subject of more importance to our people. There has been a vast economic change in the life of

America within the last three or four years. Nothing has affected our people more seriously than the development of chain stores, chain banks, mergers, and combinations. They have changed the whole industrial life of our people.

I think it proper for this body to say, not only to the Department of Justice, but to the Federal Trade Commission, and every arm of our Government that has to do with these mergers and combinations, these chain stores which are driving the little fellows out of existence, that the Congress of the United States is back of them with sufficient money to make sufficient and proper investigation, so that all the data that is needed for intelligent and constructive action may be available. Then if more legislation is needed, we will be in possession of the facts, and can give attention to the same.

I believe that the Department of Justice should have sufficient money available, if needed, so that full information may be secured on the problem of centralization of credit, monopoly in merchandising and industry, and on other phases of this merger problem. Then when they have this information, funds should be available for prosecution for the violation of the law where that is found to exist. The small-town merchant, the small-town banker, have been landmarks in our social, economic, and industrial life. Their very existence to-day is threatened. They are entitled to whatever protection can be afforded to them under existing law. The best way to give them that protection is to increase the appropriation so that the department can make a real investigation, wherever necessary. I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 10, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 10, strike out "\$203,600" and insert "\$303,600."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 10, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF COMMISSIONERS, COURT OF CLAIMS

Salaries and expenses of commissioners, Court of Claims: For salaries of seven commissioners at \$7,500 each, and for travel expenses, compensation of stenographers authorized by the court, and for stenographic and other fees and charges necessary in the taking of testimony and in the performance of the duties prescribed in the act entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation," approved February 24, 1925 (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 269-271; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 28, secs. 270, 271a), \$41,790.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We passed a bill in the House changing this whole matter with reference to commissioners of the Court of Claims. I do not know whether the gentleman's attention was called to it or not.

Mr. SHREVE. That has not yet become a law.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has only passed the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It might be necessary later to amend this so as to conform to it.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MARSHALS, DISTRICT ATTORNEYS, CLERKS, AND OTHER EXPENSES OF UNITED STATES COURTS

For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise, services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when so specially directed by the Attorney General, traveling expenses, purchase, when authorized by the Attorney General, of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vans at not to exceed \$2,500 each, and maintenance, alteration, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles used in connection with the transaction of the official business of the United States marshals, \$3,880,000: *Provided*, That there shall be paid hereunder any necessary cost of keeping vessels or other property attached or libeled in admiralty in such amount as the court, on petition setting forth the facts under oath, may allow.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 2, strike out "\$3,880,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,900,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I crave the patience of the subcommittee on this amendment. It is an increase of \$20,000. We have an increased number of deputy marshals in all of the judicial districts, but particularly in the large cities. Some of these deputy marshals are now drawing less than \$35 a week. In fact, the average pay is about \$1,800 a year, and that is just \$35 a week. We have several in the southern district of New York getting less than \$1,800. The work of a deputy marshal, the conditions under which he lives, in a center like New York City, is quite different from that of the lone deputy marshal in a small town where the judge visits it once or twice a year on his circuit. He has his car fare every morning and evening and he must provide for his lunch. Some of these men are sent down to Atlanta escorting prisoners, and I tell you that a man in a city can not live decently on \$35 a week. There are some of our men who have not even proper clothes. I have talked with Mr. Gardner about it, and he is sympathetic. He is going to do the best he can with the increase that you have allowed him, but it is going to mean a very slight increase and not sufficient to go around. In large cities, where the work of the deputy marshal is now important, we ought at least get \$20,000 more in an appropriation of \$3,880,000. The \$20,000 is not going to break the United States Government. You want good men, you want respectable men to do that kind of work. I am appealing to give them only a few dollars a year more, to at least permit them to exist.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Is not the criticism the gentleman makes relative to our deputy marshals true of every other service in the country? We establish a base rate, and the people in the country districts get the same as those in the city. The jobs in the country districts are fairly good, and in the city they are very poor and will remain so until you can make some discrimination. The same thing is true of the postal clerks. They do not get any more pay in New York City than in any other place. Mr. LAGUARDIA. In this there is a little more latitude. This is a lump-sum appropriation, and I am willing to leave it to the good judgment of the department. They can perhaps add \$75 or \$100 a year or more to some of these deputies in the large centers. I assure my colleague that the condition is bad or I would not make this appeal.

Mr. SNELL. Can you do that and give it to part and not to all?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think they will find a way of doing it.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the statement the gentleman makes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I realize that you have already given \$50,000 more, but that is not enough, because the \$50,000 covers the whole section; and when you take care of the assistant district attorneys and so on there will not be very much more left. I am appealing for these men in the big cities who are getting less than \$1,800 and doing the work of a deputy marshal.

Mr. BACON. Some of them get only \$1,620.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been coming to the attention of the committee for two or three years. Last year we made an increase of \$76,000. We have made another increase this year of \$100,000, \$50,000 of which is to apply directly to the people to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But I just heard the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in reply to an inquiry say that the cost of government is increasing and expenses are increasing, justifying another increase in another item, and properly so. We must keep up. We can not compare the number of deputy marshals to-day to the number that we had 10 years ago, or the cost of living to-day with what it was 10 years ago.

It is simply asking to start, at least to be able to tell these men that we are trying to do something for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, it is rather singular that the Attorney General, who was before our committee for several days, did not put some stress on this question that this bureau was not being properly cared for, because we have been making these increases heretofore, and we have given the estimate recommended by the Budget Bureau. Personally I may say I have been in sympathy with these men and have tried to give them more money.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think I am not violating any confidence when I say I spoke with the Attorney General the other day about it, and he told me he did not think this amount would be sufficient to bring up those men in New York to \$1,800. You know the amount we give the deputy marshals under this appropriation. I am simply asking to increase that amount by \$20,000. I hope the committee will support my amendment.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is always fair, and I think he will agree with me that it would not be an orderly way to provide appropriations if we should undertake to increase by small amounts appropriations placed in the hands of the Attorney General to be spent in the exercise of a broad discretion now vested in him by law. In other words, if in the interest of individual appeals an increase was granted, it might be construed that Congress by providing such increase considered the individual appeal had special merit and thus lead to individual appropriations. The committee has been responsive to suggestions for increases in this item not only this year but in the past, and I respectfully suggest that it would be a dangerous precedent if, because of an individual appeal, we should increase the amount just a little.

I do not question the correctness of any of the statements which the gentleman from New York makes, but here we have a large appropriation which must be expended under the discretion of the Attorney General within certain limits, and the Attorney General recommends no increase in the amount. Last year we increased it, and this year increased it again. Therefore I ask that you not increase it even by the sum of \$20,000, because other Members may feel impelled or called on to make similar special appeals for small additional amounts in the hope that it may be construed as a congressional direction to increase the pay of certain individuals in whose behalf it was suggested.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am not appealing for individuals, but for that class all over the country who are getting only \$600, and the deputy marshals, who are getting \$1,620.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If you vest in an official the right to fix salaries within certain limits and give a lump sum for that purpose, we should not interfere with the exercise of his discretion. Without the request of the official authorized to fix the salary, we should not grant increases in individual cases. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts: For mileage and per diems of jurors; for mileage and per diems of witnesses and for per diems in lieu of subsistence; and for payment of the actual expenses of witnesses, as provided by section 850, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 604), including the expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses on behalf of the Government before the United States Customs Court, such payments to be made on the certification of the attorney for the United States and to be conclusive as provided by section 846, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 577), \$3,650,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$10,000 of this amount shall be available for such compensation and expenses of witnesses or informants as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, which approval shall be conclusive.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire whether any testimony has been presented to the attention of the committee to show the inadequacy of the fees paid under the statutes to jurors serving in the United States courts.

Mr. SHREVE. That matter did not come up this year.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make that inquiry on account of an instance being called to my attention while I was at home during the holiday recess by a juror attending the court, who complained that the fees and allowances made were not sufficient to meet the expenses incurred by members of a jury while attending the United States court, particularly if they lived at a distance from the court. It is the practice when the court holds sessions for only five days a week as customary that during the week-end those living near by can go home and that the fee and mileage allowed is sufficient to compensate them.

But if they live at a distance, say, Superior, Wis., and come to Milwaukee, 350 or 375 miles away, the fees for the term do not meet their actual expenses for maintenance. I wish to ascertain if there is anything in the record to support the complaint as to the condition that was called to my attention.

Mr. SHREVE. There is nothing in the bill to change that situation. We are not a legislative committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was only asking if there was anything in the hearings bearing on the subject.

Mr. SHREVE. No; there is not.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SNELL. I am very much interested in these appropriations as is the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia], but along different lines. I wish to ask what arrangement has been made with reference to the salaries of clerks and district attorneys?

Mr. SHREVE. We have increased them. For the regular assistants we have increased the appropriation by \$266,300.

Mr. SNELL. That is, the assistants?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I have found in our country that we could not get a reasonably capable assistant for the amount that is provided. It is not a fair thing for the Department of Justice to have an underpaid district attorney go up against highly paid lawyers representing the other side.

Mr. SHREVE. If the Attorney General wants more money, if he needs more money, the officials of that department will say so when they come before us, and we want to give it.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is fair.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I notice a statement in the morning press by the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, to the effect that veterans' legislation is in need of a "complete overhauling," and also to the effect that something must be done to bring about a coordination of veterans' activities. His statement indicates that he had just returned from the White House, where he had had a conference with the President.

I do not know what the President's attitude is on the legislation we are now considering, but I do know that our uncompensated disabled veterans who need the assistance of their Government are in no position to wait a year or two for an investigation, a survey, and an overhauling of the Veterans' Bureau.

These men are dying at the rate of about 8 or 10 a day. Their wives and children in many cases are suffering for the want of attention. Many of these poor fellows are at home struggling to earn a livelihood for their families when they ought to be at home in bed or in hospitals. But they have too much love for their families to even go to a hospital and leave them without any means of support.

We are now holding hearings on House bill 7825, to extend the presumptive period of N. P. and T. B. cases to January 1, 1930, and also to amend the law to take in all chronic constitutional diseases and to repeal sections 206 and 209 of the World War veterans' act, which limited the time in which these men might file their claims or make their proofs. If we should go into the proposition of a general revision, overhauling, investigation, survey, and what not of the Veterans' Bureau it would take a year or two, and in that time many thousands of these boys would pass away.

Let us pass the bill (H. R. 7825) now before the committee, which has the approval of the veterans throughout the country and which will have the support of at least three-fourths of the membership of this House, and rescue these disabled men from the barbed-wire entanglement of red tape now existing in the Veterans' Bureau. [Applause.] Let us bring relief to them; and then, when this emergency is taken care of, we can later take up the proposition of surveying, investigating, "overhauling," readjusting, or abolishing the Veterans' Bureau, as Congress may deem proper. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For bailiffs and criers, not exceeding three bailiffs and one crier in each court, except in the southern district of New York and the northern district of Illinois; expenses of circuit and district judges of the United States and the judges of the district courts of the United States in Alaska, Porto Rico, and Hawaii, as provided by section 259 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911 (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 9 and 596); meals and lodging for jurors in United States cases, and of bailiffs in attendance upon the same, when ordered by the court, and meals and lodging for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, Title II, of the act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 639); and compensation for jury commissioners, \$5 per day, not exceeding three days for any one term of court, \$485,000: *Provided*, That no per diem shall be paid to any bailiff or crier unless the court is actually in session and the judge present and presiding or present in chambers.

For such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General for the United States courts and their officers, including experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, including also so much as may be necessary in the discretion of the Attorney General for such expenses in the District of Alaska and in courts other than Federal courts, and including travelling expenses pursuant to the subsistence expense act of 1926 (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 16), \$950,000.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who made such a fervent appeal a few moments ago to protect the Treasury of the United States. We have here a section which provides \$5 a day for bailiffs who are court attendants. Then we provide that no per diem shall be paid to any bailiff or crier unless the court is actually in session and the judge present and presiding or present in chambers. I submit that 50, 60, or 75 years ago when you paid a bailiff \$5 a day you could provide that he should not be paid if the court was not in session, but that does not apply to some of the bailiffs in New York who are now getting \$5 a day and who act as attendants upon a judge.

If the judge happens to be sick and you dock the bailiff \$5 a day, how is he going to eat and support his family? You pay him \$35 a week, and then you write a proviso that, if the court is not in session, he is not going to be paid. That may be all right for a small community where the court sits two or three weeks during the year and where the bailiff may have another occupation and simply acts as bailiff during the few weeks the court is in session in his town, but in the large centers, where you have several judges and a judge goes on his vacation for three months, then you leave the bailiff high and dry without any pay. I submit that this is not an appeal for any one individual. This is a matter of simple justice and ordinary decency in providing proper pay for these men. I know some of these bailiffs in New York, old men, who have been bailiffs for a long time. They are in a deplorable economic condition. I do not believe this is good legislation and I do not believe it represents the intent and desire of a majority of the membership of this House.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman asked that I give attention to his statement and I have. I submit to the gentleman that if he will read the proviso:

That no per diem shall be paid to any bailiff or crier unless the court is actually in session and the judge present and presiding or present in chambers—

he will recognize that is very liberal language. I assume that in New York the judges are present in chambers practically all the time.

Mr. LaGuardia. Not when they go on their vacations.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. So far as I am informed, no one stated to our committee that any injustice had been done and it was thought that the \$5 per diem, which has been provided here for this purpose, was adequate.

Mr. LaGuardia. I will say, with all due respect, that these \$35-a-week employees have not the influence or the opportunity to get somebody to speak here for them. It must be an outsider like myself, and then I am voted down by an overwhelming vote. I can not do any more than protest; and I submit that, after all, it is a rather poor thing to do in this day and age. A bailiff does not get \$35 a week; he gets \$30 a week, because the court does not sit on Sunday and the judge is not in court on Sunday. Thirty dollars a week for a bailiff in a district court! And then when a judge goes on his vacation he is left high and dry to peddle matches or pencils on the streets, with a badge on his coat, "U. S. Bailiff." What a fine thing to do!

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, just a word. We have increased this appropriation \$30,000 this time.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Support of prisoners: For support of United States prisoners, including necessary clothing and medical aid, discharge gratuities provided by law, and transportation to place of conviction or place of bona fide residence in the United States, or such other place within the United States as may be authorized by the Attorney General; and including rent, repair, alteration, and maintenance of buildings occupied under authority of sections 5537 and 5538 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 691, 692); support of prisoners becoming insane during imprisonment, and who continue insane after expiration of sentence, who have no friends to whom they can be sent; shipping remains of deceased prisoners to their friends or relatives in the United States, and interment of deceased prisoners whose remains are unclaimed; expenses incurred in identifying and pursuing escaped prisoners and for

rewards for their recapture; and for repairs, betterments, and improvements of United States jails, including sidewalks, \$3,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item includes, as we all noticed, the provisions made for the support of United States prisoners.

The item itself carries an increase of more than one-half million dollars over that carried in the existing law. I wonder if the gentleman having charge of the bill has the figures before him showing what the cost for the support of prisoners in Federal prisons was, say, 10 years back to show whether this appropriation has been unusual in its increase or whether the increase has been gradual.

Mr. SHREVE. Replying to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I would say there has been a steady increase. Starting back in 1920 we appropriated \$1,091,147. So you can see there has been a steady increase every year until last year we gave them \$2,450,000, and the estimate for this year is an even \$3,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not a rash prediction to make that in the course of a few years this item will be \$5,000,000, or perhaps \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000, because under the legislation proposed by the Department of Justice, which passed the House this past week, we are providing for additional accommodations for the housing of Federal prisoners and consequent upon that additional housing this appropriation must necessarily increase very rapidly. It is only fair to say that for this condition the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment is largely provocative, and I am not seeking to bring up a discussion of that much-mooted question in this House and much more mooted outside the Halls of Congress.

Mr. SHREVE. It has been in the minds of the members of this committee that with these largely increased appropriations for attorneys in the Attorney General's department for marshals, for jurors, and for all the various activities of the United States courts and with further appropriations for more prisons and for better treatment of the prisoners, in the long run, the work we are now doing will reduce the prison population rather than increase it.

If the law is enforced, if justice is speeded, and if prisoners are taken care of properly, this is going to have a wonderful effect upon the whole country, and this is what we are facing now with our present Attorney General.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman is one of those rare ayes who thinks the eighteenth amendment is possible of enforcement?

Mr. SHREVE. I have not said a word about the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; but the gentleman says the number of persons incarcerated in our prisons will be less as the years go on and it is the general impression of those who know about the conditions outside that if the law is more rigorously enforced more and more people will be in prison walls and fewer outside.

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no; I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I had reference to the narcotics. One-third of the prisoners to-day are narcotic addicts and we are going to try to cure these people so they will come out of the prisons.

Mr. STAFFORD. I grant you that as they get more and more of those who violate the eighteenth amendment, the proportion of those who violate the narcotic law will be less; not the number, but the proportion will be less as compared with those who will be imprisoned as the result of more stringent and forceful enforcement of the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] has supplied the information which I was going to suggest, because I know the gentleman from Wisconsin always seeks information, and since he had made a declaration which was not in conformity with information supplied to our committee, I felt he would like to consider the same. Our information was that the prisoners convicted for violating the Harrison narcotic law exceeded those of any other class of violators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman will be further interested, I am sure, along the line the gentleman from Pennsylvania was discussing, that some hope is entertained that under a wise administration of the probation law—and we think there will be such administration when the Senate has acted on the enabling acts which the House passed a few days since—many now confined in jails and prisons may, in the discretion of the judges, be placed on probation in charge of probation officers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if there is going to be any diminution of those incarcerated in Federal prisons or State prisons under existing practice by the operation of the probation law, then a considerable number of those in the eastern district of Wisconsin who are being sent to the Milwaukee House of Correction for violation of the Volstead Act will be granted liberty.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

In the remarks just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], which I think are rather typical of the remarks made by gentlemen who hold the same views with reference to the eighteenth amendment, he particularly emphasizes the undue proportion of prisoners in our various prisons, both State and Federal, who are there by reason of violation of the eighteenth amendment and laws relating thereto.

I know that a great deal of loose thinking and considerably more loose talking goes on around the country about the overwhelming proportion of such men who are in prison. For instance, in our own State of Michigan there has been circulated recently from a very reputable citizen an article that upon its face seems to be rather startling as to the proportion of those who are in our State prison convicted of liquor offenses. It was written with the idea, that seems to be quite current in these days, of emphasizing the so-called wet viewpoint.

It so happened that the Governor of the State of Michigan was with us within the last three or four days, and his attention had also been called to this particular article, and in connection with an address he made before a group of Michigan people he took particular pains to refer to the population of our own State prison, giving the figures on this very much discussed question, and thinking they might be of some interest to our distinguished friend from Wisconsin—I might say our distinguished friends from Wisconsin, who talk occasionally upon this subject—I want to submit the figures.

The total number of inmates of Jackson Prison January 1, 1930, was 4,418. Those who were there by reason of some infraction of the liquor law were 190. So out of the total population of 4,418 there were only 190 for violations of the liquor law. For robbery while armed there were 711. The governor stated in my hearing that there was that small proportion of those in our State prison by reason of infraction of the liquor law. It is far down the list of crimes for which men are sent to Jackson.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. No; I can not yield. I wanted to take this time in speaking of Michigan State prison conditions in order that members of the subcommittee might get the information available giving us a classification of the prisoners in the Federal prisons, particularly with reference to prohibition. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama, a member of the subcommittee who will give the figures for our Federal prisons.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This is the official information: The number under the drug act was 2,731; under the motor vehicle act, 1,377; under prohibition act, 1,887; under Mann Act, 241; under bankruptcy act, 43; under counterfeiting and similar offenses, 456; under postal laws, 1,068; under banking laws, 108; under immigration laws, 230; under interstate commerce laws, 121; under murder and manslaughter, 94; under offenses other than those named, 1,064.

Mr. KETCHAM. Has the gentleman from Alabama any information as to how many prisoners come from States where they have repealed the liquor enforcement law?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; we have not that information.

Mr. KETCHAM. Has the gentleman any information that he would give as to the effect of prohibition speeches made on the floor of the House as to the enforcement of the liquor laws?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; I have not.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman has some convictions on the subject?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Very decided ones.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, I can not allow the remarks of the preceding speaker to go by without bringing to the attention of the House a few facts. He has carefully brought to our attention statistics indicating the segregation of criminals in the Michigan State prison. Such statistics do not substantiate his argument that only a small percentage of persons in prisons are there because of prohibition law violations. It is only in extreme cases that prohibition law violators are confined in State penal institutions. I respectfully submit that if the gentleman from Michigan would obtain statistics from the county and other municipal jails in his State that he would not be able

to present such a good comparison as he has by submitting figures from the Michigan State prison.

I believe that if the gentleman from Michigan would visit Wisconsin he would find that there is more observance of law and order in that State to-day than there is in the State of Michigan.

As far as prohibition law violation statistics are concerned, I would respectfully suggest that the distinguished Member from Michigan talk to the chief of police of the city of Detroit, the largest city in his State, and ask him to furnish the statistics showing the extraordinary number of drunks and drunken vehicle drivers arrested in Detroit under prohibition. These statistics will compare favorably with the largest cities in every State of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AIRCRAFT IN COMMERCE

Aircraft in commerce: To carry out the provisions of the act approved May 20, 1926, entitled "An act to encourage and regulate the use of aircraft in commerce, and for other purposes" (U. S. C., title 49, secs. 171-184), as amended by the act approved February 28, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 49, sec. 173d), including salary of Assistant Secretary of Commerce (provided for in the act cited above), and other personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed \$332,880) and elsewhere; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of witnesses; purchase of furniture and equipment; stationery and supplies, including medical supplies, typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs; purchase, including exchange, not to exceed \$6,500, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase and replacement, including exchange, of airplanes (not to exceed \$95,000); purchase of airplane motors, airplane and motor accessories; spare parts, and maintenance, operation, and repair of airplanes and airplane motors; purchase of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; newspapers, reports, documents, plans, specifications, maps, manuscripts, and all other publications; and all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, \$1,200,830.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I notice a rather unusual increase of more than a quarter of a million dollars carried in this paragraph. Is that increase due to the growth of the service or to something unusual?

Mr. SHREVE. No; it is nothing unusual. It is the growth of the service. It is growing so rapidly that it is necessary to increase the appropriation. This year we had to increase the appropriation largely for the inspection of aircraft. That is to be used for the inspectors.

Mr. STAFFORD. I realize the necessity of a careful inspection of aircraft, because many of the fatal accidents that happen are due to the defective construction of airships. I realize the need of greater appropriations for their supervision and inspection. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Air-navigation facilities: For the establishment and maintenance of aids to air navigation, including the equipment of additional air-mail routes for day and night flying, the construction of necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; repairs, alterations, and all expenses of maintenance and operation; investigation, research, and experimentation to develop and improve aids to air navigation; for personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed \$95,000) and elsewhere; purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles, including their exchange; replacement, including exchange, of not to exceed three airplanes, maintenance, operation, and repair of airplanes, including accessories and spare parts and special clothing, wearing apparel, and suitable equipment for aviation purposes; and for the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease or grant, \$7,944,000, of which amount \$500,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any purpose not authorized by the air commerce act of 1926.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to insert a semicolon at the end of line 5, on page 55.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield when he gets through with his technical amendment?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will it be something substantial?

Mr. STAFFORD. It will be more substantial than the gentleman's semicolon. It is a matter of over \$2,000,000. Why is that increase made? Is it for the purchase of sites or for operation?

Mr. SHREVE. This comes under air navigation. It provides for the establishment and maintenance of aids to air navigation, including equipment of additional mail routes and night flying, and the construction of the necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus, repairs and alterations, and all expenses of maintenance, replacement, and the acquisition of necessary sites.

Permit me to say that just yesterday I was called upon by a very distinguished gentleman from Germany, Dr. Otto Merkel, who is at the head of a great airport in Berlin. This gentleman came on an airship from Buenos Aires. He said there was nothing elsewhere to compare with our radio services or the management of airships. He said that he could sit at ease in the cabin and receive and send radiograms. He said we were very much ahead of every other country. That is very gratifying. We have spent a lot of money, and we have spent it rapidly. We are bound to go on with our experiments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman tell us how this large sum is allocated to the principal activities?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. On this item the committee has recommended an increase of \$480,000 over the present year.

This appropriation covers the cost of establishing and maintaining civil airways, equipped with intermediate landing fields, boundary and beacon lights, telegraphic, telephonic, and radio communications, and weather-reporting service. Except for a relatively small amount made available to the Bureau of Standards for research designed to improve the facilities for air navigation, it is allotted by the department for expenditure by the airways division of the Lighthouse Service.

Under this fund the committee has recommended a total of \$7,944,000 for the next fiscal year, an increase of \$2,485,380 over the present year and an increase of \$250,000 over the Budget estimates.

We were very anxious to cover the whole situation as outlined to us by men from the South, men from St. Louis, men from Columbus, Ohio, men from Pittsburgh, and on east, and we gave them money enough to carry out the entire program. In addition to that, we made \$500,000 immediately available, so that the work can be started now and not started in July and run into next winter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the proposed distance of 15,400 miles of lighted airways cover virtually all of the proposed airways in the country?

Mr. SHREVE. No; I think not. I think there will be some 3,600 more before we have finished.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, with the addition of 3,600, that will complete the program, so far as lighted airways are concerned, as at present proposed and drafted?

Mr. SHREVE. Before we are done with the proposition we will have about 27,000 miles, but we are not doing it all at once.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the completed project will have a total radius of 27,000 miles?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Recognizing the interest that the membership of the House feels in the subject, I thought it would be proper at this time to say that a former distinguished Member of the House from Minnesota, Mr. Allen J. Furlow, has recently published a very accurate and interesting compilation of all laws, both State and Federal, in reference to this subject, one purpose being thereby to stimulate interest on the part of States to pass uniform laws.

It is gratifying to note that the States which have acted seem to have evinced a purpose to make the laws just as uniform as possible, feeling that in doing so they could better protect and conserve human life.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to how many States have passed this uniform aircraft legislation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Not a great number; but I hope there will be a large number added to the list during the present year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has that legislation been within the purview of the national organization for uniform legislation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; I think they have called attention to the importance of it, and so far as my information goes there has been no attempt on the part of any State to depart from the uniform legislation that has been recommended.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. No one is more disturbed than I am over the increased authorizations being made by the Congress from time to time, causing our annual Budget to rise too rapidly year by year. This particular item, however, is one of the appropriations which I feel is netting more for the development of one of the greatest activities of this age than any other. Air navigation facilities are absolutely necessary for the safety and for the continued development of commercial aviation, which is not one of those things to arrive in the future; it is already here and needs only development.

The plan referred to as having been laid out may be fairly well completed, but I am quite sure that before it is fully completed there will be other plans made larger than the original plan and that we shall go on for some time, as I think we should, in providing funds for these air-navigation facilities.

It is one of the fine things that is happening in our Government, as I see it, that we encourage by all proper means commercial aviation by private enterprise rather than to have it carried on by the Government itself. When the Post Office Department turned over the carrying of the mail to commercial companies it did one of the most sensible and far-sighted things that could have been done, both for the Government itself and for the development of aviation. I trust that these air-navigation facilities will be provided for and increased just as rapidly as they are actually needed.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. And do not commercial aviation and air-mail navigation constitute a great feature of national defense?

Mr. TILSON. They surely do; and that is the way I think the national defense should grow. The development of aviation for commercial purposes by private enterprise is being far better done, in my judgment, than it could have been done by the Army or the Navy; while in case of war it would be found a very easy matter to convert commercial aviation into national defense, which surely would be done, just as we should convert commercial trucks into carriers of soldiers, provisions, ammuni-

tion, and other supplies in case they should be needed, and every qualified pilot would be well on the way to become a military ace if, unhappily, war should come.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Promoting commerce in Latin America: Investigations in Latin America for the promotion and development of the foreign commerce of the United States, \$520,000.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill. My understanding is that you have added an appropriation of \$5,000 for a trade commissioner at Bogota and an assistant trade commissioner to Buenos Aires.

I am very much interested in furthering friendly relations with Latin America and in the development of our foreign trade in Latin America. In my own district there are tanneries, and one of the most important leather-manufacturing companies in America produces leather in Lowell, the city where I live.

As the United States is the largest producer of leather in the world, this country requires more cattle hides than any other leather-producing country. More than 20,000,000 cattle hides are tanned annually in the United States, while the local yearly production of these hides in late years has averaged less than 15,000,000.

Therefore, in order to fully satisfy the domestic requirements of the American tanneries, more than 5,000,000 cattle hides must be imported each year. These hides are obtained from a wide range of sources and virtually every producing country supplies some share of these requirements. Approximately 20 per cent of the world's production of cattle hides is obtainable from South American countries, and the quality of a large share of these is equal to that produced in any other country and better than that obtainable from most producing centers. The competition for these cattle hides has been and still is especially keen, as European producers are very anxious to obtain a large supply of them each year. Thus far, however, American tanners have been successful in purchasing the largest share of the hides exported from most South American countries. I shall insert in the Record here as a part of my remarks a table showing the imports of cattle hides into the United States from South America in late years.

United States imports of cattle hides from South America  
[In pieces]

	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	9 months, 1929 <sup>1</sup>
Argentina.....	3,356,488	3,080,445	2,020,550	1,802,572	1,616,388	2,491,649	3,642,380	1,793,660
Bolivia.....	9,275	7,818	1,144	652	2,579	450	901	.....
Brazil.....	379,932	236,053	32,154	57,161	9,625	163,606	356,909	138,124
Chile.....	23,912	25,473	15,825	16,977	1,967	2,908	2,794	503
Colombia.....	333,524	320,192	248,772	256,256	194,603	170,332	185,676	76,767
Ecuador.....	9,247	9,748	588	1,929	6,459	10,320	10,560	414
Paraguay.....	11,292	.....	.....	.....	2,000	.....	.....	.....
Peru.....	15,854	9,350	2,905	3,737	1,329	3,027	7,632	474
Uruguay.....	429,240	433,105	205,104	38,992	124,213	89,438	192,207	161,473
Venezuela.....	84,242	96,747	84,162	113,507	77,905	63,052	77,221	28,704
Others.....	.....	624	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total South America.....	4,652,906	4,219,555	2,611,205	2,294,783	2,035,068	2,996,782	4,476,280	2,200,119
Total all countries.....	7,207,893	6,705,221	3,882,235	3,817,234	3,354,220	5,142,670	6,135,698	3,823,568

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary figures.

I want to touch upon the desirability of sending a leather expert to South America.

Massachusetts is the most important center of the tanning industry in the United States, as can readily be determined from the statistics of the United States Bureau of the Census. Of the more than 490 tanning establishments operating in the United States reporting to this bureau, almost 25 per cent are in the State of Massachusetts. This State gives employment to more than 10,400 workers of the some 53,000 employed in the American tanning industry, and its wages to these employees in 1927, the latest year for which official data are available, totaled more than \$14,587,638. The tanning industry in the State of Massachusetts purchased raw materials to the value of \$47,860,959 in 1927, and produced leather having a sales value of more than \$77,649,457. The figures quoted are all official statistics obtained from the United States Bureau of the Census, and should not be mistaken for rough estimates. Conditions in this industry have been very unfavorable for the past nine years, and there are no indications of any improvement in the immediate future.

Producers have found it very difficult to find profitable outlets for their products and many were forced to cease operations, while others continued at a considerable financial loss. The official reports quoted from previously show that in 1923 there were 122 tanneries operating in Massachusetts in 1923, ceased operations within the next two years, and since then and up to 1927, 3 other establishments stopped the unprofitable manufacture of this commodity. Information from reliable sources is responsible for the statement that since 1927 other leather factories have closed, and more workers were thrown out of employment.

The American tanning industry as a whole has been conspicuously unprofitable since 1920, and generally speaking the Massachusetts branch of this industry will not show any favorable return on its investments for 1929. As an indication of the losses incurred by the Massachusetts tanneries I quote from the balance sheets of three important firms, these being issued by reputable accountants like Ernst & Ernst, and Whiteside and published in such papers as the Wall Street Journal:

## Invested capital

Firm	Net sales	Preferred stock	Common	Surplus	Profit and loss
American Hide & Leather Co. (18 months to June, 1928):					
1926	\$12,441,406	\$11,500,000	\$11,500,000	\$5,961,722	\$150,750
1927	13,676,139	10,000,000	11,500,000	6,576,721	143,264
1928	18,778,404	10,000,000	11,500,000	5,066,772	1,570,768
National Leather Co.:					
1926	24,556,398	13,000,000	7,500,000	4,173,749	550,798
1927	24,866,444	13,000,000	7,500,000	3,019,388	1,154,362
1928	24,137,887	13,000,000	7,500,000	2,445,617	108,701
Barnet Leather Co.:					
1926		1,000,000	2,000,000	1,021,218	273,068
1927		1,000,000	2,000,000	1,644,751	322,468
1928		1,000,000	2,000,000	1,181,991	392,759

<sup>1</sup> Denotes losses.

Other firms have suffered in proportion, and some of these have closed their factories, throwing many people out of employment, rather than sustain additional losses. This condition in the tanning industry is not confined to Massachusetts, and a study of the balance sheets of tanneries in other States will also show considerable losses.

That this industry, not only in Massachusetts but in the entire United States, needs assistance can be readily seen from the statistics just given. It must be aided in finding profitable outlets for their surplus production in order to keep their plants operating. They are not only finding the competition in their domestic markets much keener but they are also meeting with more acute competition in foreign markets. Whereas most of the other leading leather-producing countries sell more than 20 per cent of their production to foreign markets, the American tanners can only find outlets for about 10 per cent of their output in export markets. The tanners are in urgent need of a trained observer in South America to advise them as to the prospects for the sale of their leathers, the competition they will meet, and the types of this commodity most in demand. These observers could not only report on leather but also on allied products, such as boots, shoes, and other leather manufactures. South America has been an important consumer of American leathers, but owing to a growing local production producers in the United States are finding it more difficult to maintain their sales in this territory. It is very urgent that they be afforded some aid in marketing their products in this area, and the best possible aid that could be given would be the allocation of funds for the appointment of a trained observer who could readily make such surveys as would be helpful in expanding the sales of American products.

A fact that is seldom realized is that the United States is dependent on foreign sources for a very important share of the hides and skins tanned into leather. The American tanning industry is now depending on foreign sources for approximately 25 per cent of its requirements in cattle hides; 45 per cent of the calfskins; 99½ per cent of the goat and kid skins; and more than 60 per cent of the sheep and lamb skins. South American countries are important producers of these raw materials, for which there is a large world-wide demand, and the competition among buyers for these hides and skins is very keen. The trained observer previously mentioned could be of material aid to the tanners in the United States in improving the facilities for obtaining these essential raw stocks. This continent is also an important source for necessary tanning materials, especially quebracho, which is not produced elsewhere, and large amounts are purchased for American account. Just how much aid an observer could give can readily be understood. He would report on the activities of foreign buyers, trends in the market, causes for declines or increases in prices, production, and sales to competing countries. This observer would also recommend responsible buyers for those American firms that can not afford the financial outlay required to have a personal representative.

A careful study of the facts contained in this brief will readily prove the necessity of having a trained observer in this territory to study conditions. American leather valued at slightly more than \$6,000,000 was sold in South America during 1928, but preliminary figures record a marked decline in the first 10 months of 1929. The decline is chiefly attributed to increased competition from European sources and a growing local production by many South American countries. American tanners would be helped considerably in marketing their leather in this continent if they were aware of the demand for specific types of leather, knew the extent of competition offered by local and foreign firms, and had technical details regarding the

requirements of the larger users of foreign leathers. It would also be of material aid to them to know the prices being quoted from time to time for the various kinds of leather, and to know definitely the qualities of leather most in demand. Such information can only be obtained from a trained observer spending much of his time in ascertaining the facts required.

Of the 6,155,698 cattle hides, and the 53,472,062 goat and kid skins imported into the United States in 1928, 4,476,280 of the former and 8,390,466 of the latter came from South America. South America also supplied about 98 per cent of the total quebracho logs and extracts imported into the United States. America is the largest leather-producing country in the world, and it can only continue maintaining its present position by obtaining the necessary raw materials. This industry is worthy of such aid as the Government can extend, and I heartily recommend that an observer be appointed to this important field which means so much to the American leather industry. This will prove beyond question a valuable and helpful investment which will aid in bringing appreciated profits to one of my industries which has suffered so much loss in the past 10 years.

Mr. SHREVE. We are very happy, indeed, to contribute in a way to the wishes of the lady and her associates back home, bringing prosperity and happiness to her people, especially the manufacturers, by granting these additional commercial attachés and trade commissioners, as has been suggested, and we hope it will be a very profitable investment on the part of the Government.

Mrs. ROGERS. The committee has been extremely gracious in granting my request this year, and in fact, every year. Of course, development of our foreign and domestic commerce is a national as well as a local matter, and I am delighted that the committee has also granted \$5,000 for a textile expert for the Boston office of the Department of Commerce. This man can tell our New England textile-manufacturing companies what they can produce that does not compete with the cotton industry of the South. They can manufacture more cheaply than we can owing to their hours of labor and also owing to their lower wages. It will benefit the southern mills as well as the northern mills if we can make in New England products that are not in competition with them, and not so much in competition with the lower-wage products of Europe.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I thought the House would be interested to know that, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] states, the committee was impressed with the persuasive and informing statement submitted in connection with the appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce by the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. The information which she gave the committee was not only helpful but largely responsible for the favorable action taken in reference to these items. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS. I am extremely grateful to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], and I think the country ought to know what an enormous amount of good the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN], and other members of the subcommittee have done in opening the world markets to us. At the present time we sell our goods in Europe, South America, and other countries, and we import from them to the very great benefit of this country. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

District and cooperative office service: For all expenses necessary to operate and maintain district and cooperative offices, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs, purchase of maps, books of reference and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, not exceeding \$1,200 for newspapers, both foreign and domestic, for which payment may be made in advance, and all other publications necessary for the promotion of the commercial interests of the United States, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, \$685,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce may require as a condition for the opening of a new office or the continuation of an existing office that commercial organizations in the district affected provide suitable quarters without cost to the Government or at rentals at lower than prevailing rates. The Secretary may, at his discretion, refuse to open a new office or continue an existing office where such assistance from local commercial organizations is not provided.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not think there is a service which the Government performs that is bringing greater return to the people of the United States than this district and cooperative office service in

promoting the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States.

It is my understanding that in the last year between four and five hundred million dollars worth of business has been obtained for American firms and American agriculture through the services performed by these offices. This is a remarkable return upon the investment.

It is probably forty or fifty times the appropriations that have been made for this service for a long time past; and it seems to me the committee ought to be commended for taking action to provide some slight additional appropriation to provide for the expansion of these domestic offices, and also to provide for the appointment of such additional ones as they feel are required by trade necessities.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. As one who is somewhat ignorant of this particular activity of the Government, what is the significance of the words "district" and "cooperative"?

Mr. BRIGGS. The district offices are official offices of the Department of Commerce. The cooperative offices are offices maintained largely by chambers of commerce having a cooperative relationship with the Department of Commerce. The latter offices are not official offices, but enjoy semiofficial contact with the Department of Commerce; my understanding is there are about 50 of these cooperative offices in the United States and 29 of the official district offices.

These offices bring the seller of American goods into contact with buyers abroad. They offer him services which it is impossible for him to obtain from any other source, because the commercial attachés and the trade commissioners of the United States, scattered throughout the world, have governmental contacts and means of finding out and ascertaining trade opportunities which are not open to private individuals or private firms.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. Do they give any credit information to American sellers?

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes, indeed. They give all kinds of information of the highest value; in fact, I have a letter from Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, which I shall ask leave to insert in the Record, relating to the service of the district offices at Galveston and Houston, showing that during the last year 58 firms voluntarily reported they had rendered to them alone services amounting to about \$4,210,000 in just those two areas. I understand there were very many more firms, agricultural and industrial interests, served that made no report. A good deal of such service is what the gentleman from New York refers to—preventive service—that is, advising people as to whether or not it is wise to make sales in certain countries and protecting the prospective American seller against certain sales where they would probably have difficulty in realizing upon them as well as disclosing to those engaged in agriculture and industry opportunities where they might further advance and expand their commerce.

The letter from Assistant Secretary Klein, of the Department of Commerce, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,  
Washington, December 4, 1929.

Hon. CLAY STONE BRIGGS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Remembering the interest you took in the establishment of the district offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at Houston and Galveston, you will, I am sure, be glad to have some details as to the actual dollars-and-cents results achieved by these offices.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, 58 firms reported voluntarily that they had secured new business or had benefited by preventive services to the extent of \$4,210,350 through the efforts of the above offices. The preventive services were in the form of savings through negative information leading to the curtailment of certain unwise export plans, the discouragement of expenditures in exploiting dubious markets, etc. These offices are serving some 420 Texas and New Mexico firms, so that the total results of their trade promotive efforts are probably many times the figure mentioned, many firms reporting that it was impossible to estimate the dollars-and-cents results, but paying high tribute to the services by the Houston and Galveston branches.

I am sure you will agree that in view of the modest budgets of these offices, totaling less than \$31,000, the above figure represents a decidedly substantial "dividend" for the taxpayer.

For all of the 29 offices throughout the country there were voluntary reports during the fiscal year 1928-29 from 1,021 firms (out of some

22,000 currently using the bureau's services) showing results achieved for them which totaled \$42,651,854. Since this represents about one-twentieth of the bureau's regular clientele, it would seem that the total value of the efforts of the organization in behalf of American business is many times this amount.

In addition to being "service stations" on export trade, the Texas offices have endeavored to serve as clearing houses for firms seeking information on all problems connected with domestic marketing. While this phase of the work has been limited due to the small available personnel, the offices have been able to serve some firms by giving exact information concerning our domestic markets and the various practices in marketing.

I am sure you will understand my mentioning these details to you as being not in any sense a "glorification" of the bureau but simply as part of a businesslike accounting to Congress of the stewardship of our staff and its obligations under the appropriations voted by Congress for the last year.

Cordially yours,

JULIUS KLEIN.

Of course, we in the United States are being more and more concerned to-day with not only what to do with our agricultural products from a productive standpoint but particularly from a market standpoint. The same is true with our manufactured products. We have been prone to look upon Europe as our greatest market, and up to now that has probably been so. But recently we have been turning our attention more and more to the Latin-American countries, where it is said exists the greatest market for American products in the future. This service of the Department of Commerce is bound to be of very material aid in getting this new market for us. It has largely made possible the automobile expansion there, as we sell practically 90 per cent of the automobiles bought in South America. It has increased the value of the leather market and expanded our flour trade, especially from the Southwest.

It is likewise true with reference to development of the lumber and textile trade, and the opportunity which it is affording the American manufacturer and American producer to further increase exports will be of further inestimable benefit to them. I therefore take occasion now to commend the subcommittee and the full committee for its appreciation of the importance of this service to the American people.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRIGGS. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. In the course of the gentleman's remarks he has referred two or three times to the commercial attachés. Will he be kind enough to give the committee the significance of the word "attaché" as attached to the commercial life abroad. What does it mean to the country over there?

Mr. BRIGGS. It makes them a part of the legation or the embassy of the United States.

Mr. KETCHAM. And that is important?

Mr. BRIGGS. Extremely important, because it gives governmental contact which no business engaged in agriculture or industry possesses. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for leave to extend my remarks by including a letter from Hon. Julius Klein, the highly efficient Assistant Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the promotion of foreign and domestic commerce, or either, and also expenses of illustrating the work of the bureau by showing of maps, charts, and graphs at such meetings, when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this makes provision for not only the employees of the foreign and domestic commerce at home but those abroad to attend the regional trade conferences, visit around the American States, and make their report of activities to business and agriculture and point out trade opportunities existing abroad within their sphere of activity.

Mr. SHREVE. That has been found to be a very important part of the activities of the Department of Commerce. We find these men going about the country and coming in contact with manufacturers and wholesalers, people who are interested in foreign trade. They have been getting closer together. A man may have been stationed in Berlin, say, and he comes back home and visits some place throughout the country, and he meets men who have something to sell that may be sold in Berlin.

That is personal contact. It is working out so well that the President desires that more of the consular agents shall travel

about the country in addition to the men of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BRIGGS. Referring to the regional trade conferences, for instance, I wish to say that the one in the southwestern area of the United States is going to hold a meeting in Texas in April; that there is the greatest interest manifested in it, with the expectation of meeting a number of the commercial attachés and trade commissioners; and it is expected and hoped that the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Doctor Klein, will be present also on that occasion and visit Galveston and Dallas as well as Houston.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Commerce, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to furnish the officers and employees in the Foreign Commerce Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce stationed outside the continental limits of the United States, without cost to them and within the limits of this appropriation allowances for living quarters, heat, and light, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 70), \$200,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph just read, and I may press the point of order. I believe this is an entirely new paragraph, providing to officers and employees allowances for quarters abroad.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, this is to conform with a similar practice adopted under the Department of State. That is found to be very necessary in foreign countries, particularly for the reason that the salaries of our men in foreign countries are not large and this will enable rental allowances in most instances less than \$1,000 until the foreign-building program is completed. They have more or less official necessity for an automobile at times and we have also included a 7 cents a mile provision for that. The men are burdened down to such an extent that this is the only way that we could give relief to every one in that foreign service, both in the Department of State and in the Department of Commerce. This item in the Department of Commerce is simply to put it on the same level with the Department of State.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any such provision in this bill applicable to the Department of State?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes; carried some years.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman means that it is specifically authorized in the so-called Rogers Act.

Mr. SHREVE. It has been in this bill for some time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman will find it under the head of contingent expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman the phraseology of it there?

Mr. SHREVE. There may be a slight difference in language, but it is all for the same purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are granting to the Secretary of Commerce a wonderful latitude in dispensing an unlimited amount for housing expense.

Mr. SHREVE. He could not spend any more money than we have appropriated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Two hundred thousand dollars is no small sum for entertainment and the like.

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman gets the wrong idea. This is not for entertainment. There is another item originally included in the State Department's estimates for entertainment, or representation allowances, but we refused to consider it. This is for actual bona fide rental expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was unintentionally misled when the gentleman said that they were subject to considerable expense in the way of entertainment.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Is not this for the purpose of equalizing the differential in costs in different places?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. In some places the cost is high and yet the salary of the official is exactly the same as where the cost is low?

Mr. SHREVE. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. And in the discretion of the Secretary, the living costs may be equalized in this way?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are burdening the taxpayers to the extent of \$200,000 for the first time for that equalization, and that is no small sum.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. That may be so.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman will be interested to know that the Budget officer approved an item of this

kind for the State Department, and, as it often follows, when you allow it for one department you must allow it for others similarly situated. It is for fuel, light, quarters, and it is estimated that this will provide an average allowance of \$1,000 for that purpose, and personally I feel that such an allowance for both State and Commerce officials, serving foreign stations, should be limited to a reasonable maximum sum by a proper proviso.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he will not move to rise at this time so that I may examine the hearings. I do not wish to press the point of order at this time, but I would like to consider the item further in view of what has been said.

Mr. GARNER. Ask him whether it is authorized by law.

Mr. SHREVE. No; it is not authorized by law. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8960, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I be granted 30 minutes in which to discuss flood conditions in the Wabash Valley and southwestern Indiana.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON, to act as Speaker pro tempore to-morrow.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 64. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to secure for the United States title to certain private lands contiguous to and within the Militia Target Range Reservation, State of Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2005. An act to authorize the city of Oakland, Calif., to use the Coast Guard cutter *Bear* as a nautical training ship; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2668. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at Boonville, Mo., in substitution for and in lieu of an existing bridge constructed under the authority of an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at Boonville, Mo.," approved May 11, 1872; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 234. An act to provide books and educational supplies free of charge to pupils of the public schools of the District of Columbia.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, January 29, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, January 29, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m. and 2 p. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

Deficiency appropriation bill.

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at the United States Naval Hospital, Washington, D. C. (H. R. 8866).

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

Extending protection to the American Eagle (H. R. 7994).  
To amend the migratory bird treaty act with respect to bag limits and more effectively to meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty (H. R. 5278).

## COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(10 a. m.)

To amend the World War veterans' act, 1924 (H. R. 7825).

## COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10.30 a. m.)

To further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States (H. R. 8361).

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

293. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill to authorize funds for the construction of a building at Corozal, Canal Zone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

294. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8807. A bill to provide for the coordination of the public-health activities of the Government, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. Con. Res. 1. A concurrent resolution providing for the acceptance of a statue of Charles Marion Russell, presented by the State of Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 545). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. Con. Res. 6. A concurrent resolution accepting the statue of the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, to be placed in Statuary Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 546). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. J. Res. 171. A joint resolution providing for the observance and commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of the Monongahela, and establishing a commission to be known as the United States Battle of the Monongahela Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 8372. A bill to provide for the construction and equipment of an annex to the Library of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 217. A joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the support of the Federal Radio Commission during the fiscal year 1930 in accordance with the act approved December 18, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1066. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Harris; with amendment (Rept. No. 543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Don A. Spencer; with amendment (Rept. No. 544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2075) for the relief of Addie Belle Smith, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 9223) to authorize the designation of depositories for public documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 9224) to authorize an appropriation for the completion of a sea wall at Selfridge Field, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 9225) to supplement the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and prescribe a method for the fixing of rates of public utilities employed in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 9226) to amend the first paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9227) to establish additional salary grades for mechanic's helpers in the motor-vehicle service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 9228) to amend the Judicial Code, section 266 (U. S. Code of Laws, title 28, sec. 380), being the act approved March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to modify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 9229) to provide for the commemoration of the termination of the War between the States at Appomattox Court House, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9230) to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 9231) providing for the acquisition of additional lands for the naval air station at Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9232) to regulate the rates of wages to be paid to laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public works of the United States and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 9233) to prescribe a certain oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9234) to provide monuments to mark the birthplaces of former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 9235) to authorize the Public Health Service to provide medical service in the Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9236) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oregon and the Stock Slough drainage district to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Stock Slough, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9237) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oregon and the Beaver Slough drainage district to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Beaver Slough drainage district, Coquille River, Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9238) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oregon and the Larson Slough drainage district to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Larson Slough, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) providing for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAAS: Resolution (H. Res. 137) to appoint a committee to investigate organizations and associations relative to protests against the military and naval defense programs of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 9239) for the relief of Alfred S. Jewell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9240) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Gilchrist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9241) for the relief of Anna Gleeson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9242) for the relief of Ralph Ryle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 9243) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth V. Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 9244) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay to R. B. Baugh, M. D., certain money due him for services rendered as a member of the local board of Smith County, Miss., operated during the World War; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 9245) for the relief of Davis, Howe & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 9246) to reimburse Lieut. Col. Frank J. Killilea; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9247) for the retirement of Arthur Maxwell O'Connor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9248) granting a pension to Mary F. O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9249) granting an increase of pension to John Albert Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9250) granting a pension to Jennie R. Dix; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9251) for the retirement of Daniel W. Tanner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9252) granting a pension to Myra A. Pennington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9253) granting an increase of pension to Melissa E. Bemis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9254) granting a pension to Sarah Linnehan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9255) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Sutherland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9256) for the relief of Ellen A. Farrelly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9257) for the relief of William H. Rounceville; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 9258) granting a pension to Thomas Keenan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 9259) providing for a survey and examination of Barron River, at Everglades, Collier County, Fla., across Chokoloskee Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, to provide a width and depth of channel suitable to the needs of said port; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 9260) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Doran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9261) granting a pension to Virginia Jane Harman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 9262) for the relief of the Pecahontas Fuel Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 9263) to provide for examination and survey of routes for a canal across the State of Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 9264) for the relief of Edward Bodeck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9265) to reimburse certain eastern Cherokees who removed themselves to the Cherokee Nation under the terms of the eighth article of the treaty of December 29, 1835; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9266) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel B. Inman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9267) for the relief of John A. Fay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9268) granting an increase of pension to Emma W. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9269) granting a pension to Lois Cooke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 9270) granting an increase of pension to Marietta Bledsoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 9271) for the relief of Le Roy Moyer, Supply Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9272) for the relief of Kremer & Hog, Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 9273) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Lieut. Albert F. Hegenberger, Air Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9274) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Lieut. Lester P. Maitland, Air Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 9275) granting a pension to William F. Sheean; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9276) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fraley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9277) to secure a survey of Brunswick Harbor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9278) for the relief of James Julian Flinders and Harriet B. Flinders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 9279) for the relief of Henry A. Knott & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9280) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way for street purposes upon and across the Holabird Quartermaster Depot Military Reservation, in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 9281) for the relief of Warren J. Clear; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 9282) for the relief of Elmer Fritsch, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 9283) granting a pension to Mary Holder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9284) providing that an additional pension shall be granted to Fannie S. Skinner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 9285) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Turman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9286) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 9287) for the relief of Oscar W. Behrens; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 9288) for the relief of the Merchants & Farmers Bank, Junction City, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9289) for the relief of the First National Bank, of El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9290) for the relief of the National Bank of Commerce, El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORT of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9291) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Keel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 9292) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Hazlett Wonderlich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 9293) granting a pension to Rachel De Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 9294) granting an increase of pension to Olive H. Miltenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9295) granting an increase of pension to Hester E. Ware; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 9296) for the relief of Jacob King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3687. By Mr. ANDRESEN: Petition of citizens of Minnesota, urging the passage of the pension bill now before Congress granting an increase in pensions to Spanish American War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3688. Also, petition of citizens of Hutchinson, Minn., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill granting an increase of pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3689. By Mr. BEERS: Petition from residents of Huntingdon County, Pa., favoring the passage of Senate bill 476 and House

bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3690. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted by the New York Board of Trade, New York City, urging the reduction of passport fee to that which was charged prior to World War, and opposing a change that would merely extend the period for which a passport was issued; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3691. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Harry L. Strawn and 52 other citizens of Mendota, Ill., asking for speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3692. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of 27 citizens of Woodbury County, Iowa, urging the speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3693. By Mr. CHASE: Petition of certain citizens of Bradford, Pa., twenty-third congressional district of Pennsylvania, urging action during present session on legislation providing for increases in pensions of veterans of Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

3694. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of Franco-Belgian citizens of Lawrence, Mass., for modification of Volstead Act and requesting Congress to relieve the great unemployment and suffering among the working people of the textile industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3695. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Janesville, Wis., urging the passage of a bill to increase pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3696. By Mr. CORNING: Petition signed by William P. Scurry and other citizens of Watervliet, N. Y., urging passage of House bill 2562, providing for an increase of pension to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3697. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of National Guard Association of the United States, indorsing the findings contained in the interdepartmental report dealing with the pay of personnel of the armed services of the United States and requesting Congress to enact a pay bill into law which will carry out the recommendations of said report; to the Committee on Pensions.

3698. Also, petition of the Linnean Society of New York, unanimously approving and supporting the bill which has recently been introduced into the Senate and House to afford adequate Federal protection to the American eagle and to put a penalty on its wanton destruction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3699. Also, resolution of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, numbering 400 members, urging Congress to pass the bald eagle protection act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3700. Also, petition of the New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, indorsing the principle of the Englebright forest fire bill and requesting its speedy enactment into law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3701. Also, petition that whereas the Federal Government will spend \$10,000,000 for the establishment of permanent game refuges, the New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League requests the Government to establish as the first refuge in this State the tract now under consideration in the locality generally known as the Tonawanda Swamp, in the counties of Niagara, Genesee, and Erie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3702. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the country during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3703. Also, resolution of the Women's Committee for Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, of the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the submission to the people of the country the question of retaining or repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3704. By Mr. DAVILA: Petition of sundry citizens of the municipalities of San Juan, Ponce, Caguas, Arecibo, Cayey, Manati, San German, Corozal, Aibonito, Lejas, Lares, and Vieques, P. R., requesting speedy consideration on and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

3705. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of certain citizens of Alexander County, urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3706. Also, petition of certain citizens of Elkville, Jackson County, Ill., urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3707. By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of citizens of Marion County, Iowa, opposed to any calendar change; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3708. Also, petition of citizens of the State of Iowa, urging increased pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

3709. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by various citizens of Bronx County, urging the speedy passage of legislation providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3710. By Mr. GARBBER of Oklahoma: Petition of National Guard Association of the United States, New York, N. Y., indorsing bill dealing with pay of personnel of the armed services of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3711. Also, petition of 128 members of California Press Association, urging that McNary resolution before Senate Agricultural Committee be given preference over Johnson-Box bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3712. Also, petition of Oklahoma-Kansas Division of Mid-Continent Royalty Owners Association, urging support of tariff on oil and crude petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3713. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Wayne Barrett and 21 other citizens of Carrsville, Livingston County, Ky., urging the passage of a bill granting increased pensions to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3714. Also, petition of C. B. Holland and 42 other citizens of Lyon County, Ky., urging the removal of Lock and Dam F from the Cumberland River at Eddyville, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3715. By Mr. GREEN: Petition of citizens of Suwanee County, Fla., urging increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3716. Also, petition of citizens of Lamont, Jefferson County, Fla., urging increased pensions for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3717. Also, petition of citizens of Alachua County, Fla., urging increased pensions for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3718. Also, petition of citizens of McIntosh, Marion County, Fla., urging increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3719. Also, petition of citizens of Ocala, Fla., urging increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3720. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of 35 citizens of the State of Illinois, urging indorsement of House bill 3547, providing for clarification of requirements of naturalization oath as to religious and philosophical views held by intending citizens on the subject of war; to the Committee on Naturalization and Immigration.

3721. By Mr. HALL of Illinois: Petition of residents of Dwight, Ill., urging the passage of pension legislation in behalf of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3722. Also, petition of W. A. Wagner and 67 other citizens of Pontiac, Ill., urging the passage of pension legislation in behalf of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3723. Also, petition signed by citizens of Livingston County, Ill., urging additional legislation for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

3724. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Charles T. Kalles and other residents of Westville, Ind., urging the early passage of a bill increasing the pension of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3725. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of N. M. Nelson and 40 other citizens of Spokane, Wash., asking for speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increase of pensions to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3726. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of S. R. L. Batte, A. H. Baskin, W. H. Triggs, G. P. Rountree, George T. Graves, E. J. Rinn, A. C. Freeman, T. S. Henderson, C. N. Green, A. N. Green, and S. W. McCleran, of Cameron, Tex., favoring tariff on vegetable oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3727. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of Warren Pryor and other residents of Portsmouth, in the sixth congressional district of Ohio, urging that favorable action be taken by Congress on the bill to increase the rates of pension for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3728. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of citizens of Braddock and North Braddock, Pa., asking for establishment of department of education; to the Committee on Education.

3729. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition signed by Ida A. Smith and 11 other residents of Otsego, Mich., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3730. By Mrs. LANGLEY: Petition of James C. Jones, Kelly Turner, Pauline Flinchum, and 65 other citizens of Perry County, Ky., urging speedy consideration and the passage of Senate bill 465 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3731. Also, petition of F. S. Knox, jr., W. H. Saulsbury, G. H. Hudson, and 60 other citizens of Letcher County, Ky., urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3732. By Mr. LEE of Texas: Petition of citizens of Ballinger, Tex., urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3733. By Mr. McCLOSKEY: Petition of John H. Malinack and 79 other residents of San Antonio, Tex., favoring the passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3734. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Isaac Dodrill and other citizens of McLoud, Okla., urging speedy consideration of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3735. By Mr. MAAS: Resolution adopted by the council of the city of St. Paul, Minn., relative to commemorating the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3736. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Morenci and Monroe, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3737. By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Petition of J. F. Ryan, F. W. Robinson, R. N. Wrenn, and others, petitioning Congress for the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3738. By Mr. MOUSER: Petition of citizens of Findlay and Alvada, Ohio, asking that favorable consideration be given to House bill 2562, known as the Spanish-American War pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

3739. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the McNary resolution over the Johnson-Box quota bills for Mexico; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3740. By Mr. PRALL: Petition signed by citizens of the Borough of Richmond, Staten Island, N. Y., in favor of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period, received from Alexander J. Barry, 21 Clark Place, West New Brighton, Staten Island, N. Y., a veteran of 1898; to the Committee on Pensions.

3741. Also, petition received from citizens of Staten Island, N. Y., approving the creation of a national department of education to strengthen the public-school system; to the Committee on Education.

3742. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of Ernest A. Matthews and 61 other residents of Springfield, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3743. By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Thomas Swearingen and 143 others, favoring Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3744. By Mr. STONE: Petition of various citizens of the State of Oklahoma, urging enactment of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3745. Also, petition of various citizens of the State of Oklahoma, urging enactment of a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3746. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of R. G. Sanderson and 57 residents of New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, for the relief of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

3747. By Mr. SWING: Petition of C. R. Lewis and 82 other citizens of Elinore, Calif., favoring the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3748. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of S. E. Waddell and others, of Chester, Pa., and vicinity, urging legislation to provide increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3749. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Avonmore, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging passage of Robsion-Capper bill, providing for Federal department of education; to the Committee on Education.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, January 29, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Kean	Sheppard
Baird	Frazier	Kendrick	Shipstead
Barkley	George	Keyes	Simmons
Bingham	Gillett	La Follette	Smith
Black	Glass	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Steak
Blease	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Borah	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Sullivan
Bratton	Gould	Moses	Swanson
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Grundy	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Hale	Nye	Townsend
Caraway	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Connally	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Copeland	Hatfield	Patterson	Vandenberg
Couzens	Hawes	Phipps	Wagner
Cutting	Hebert	Pine	Walcott
Dale	Heflin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Deneen	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Johnson	Robson, Ky.	Watson
Fess	Jones	Schall	Wheeler

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is detained from the Senate on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] is necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I also wish to announce that the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are necessarily absent from the sessions of the Senate attending a conference in the West relative to the diversion of the waters of the Colorado River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., submitting, pursuant to law, the report of the company for the full year 1929, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, protesting against the passage of the bill (S. 3180) relating to the qualifications of civil commissioners for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union protesting against the action of the Secretary of the Navy in suspending the Navy wage board hearings and favoring the reconvening of that board at an early date, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented a resolution adopted by Algonac Lodge, No. 11, Shipmasters' Association of the Great Lakes, at Algonac, Mich., protesting against the passage of legislation to provide for the establishment of shipping commissioners at ports on the Great Lakes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.